OR, SOME

IMPARTIAL REFLECTIONS

ON THE

DEAN of *LONDONDERRY's* CONSIDERATIONS

That Obliged him to come over to the Communion

OF THE

Church of Rome.

AND

Mr. Chancellor *KING's* Answer thereto.

IN WHICH

He no less Unjustly than Impertinently Reflects, on the

protestant Dissenters.

In a Letter to a Friend.

By W. B. D. D.

---

3 *Ep.* Joh. 9. 10. *But* Diotrephes, *who loveth to have the Preeminence among them, receives us not---Neither doth he himself receive the Brethren, and forbideth them that would, and casteth them out of the Church.*

DUBLIN:

Printed by *A. Crook*, and *S. Helsham*, Printers to the Kings most Excellent Majesty on *Ormond-Key*, and sold by the Booksellers of *London*, and *Westminster*. 1688.

IMPARTIAL REFLECTIONS

ON THE

DEAN of LONDONDERRY'S CONSIDERATIONS

That Oblig'd him to come over to the Communion

OF THE

Church of Rome.

AND

In Answer thereto.

IN WHICH

Protestant Dilemma's

TO THE
READER.

THOU wilt find the worthy Author of this enſuing Tract, oppoſing two perſons of a very different Character. M: M. whoſe ſcruples are ſo mean, and ſo often anſwered; that as they could have little influence in his Change, ſo they deſerved no new Conſideration. The moſt material of his Queſtions may be reduced to this, Being that the Church of Rome by her uſurping ſhifts propagated her Apoſtacy to her neighbour Churches, how can any of thoſe belong to the Catholick Church if they ceas that Apoſtacy, and regain their former ſtate? The anſwer is eaſie unl ſs infection do for ever ſubject a Church to that Church which infected it. Can any man daubt whether the Britiſh Churches had equal authority to reform themſelves for Chriſt's ſake, as they had to admit theſe corruptions for the Popes ſake.

The other Perſon is M: K: who hath needleſly yea to the apparent dammage of his cauſe, bitterly cenſured the whole body of Nonconformiſts. Whether his novel notions, or the unſeaſonable publication of matters of debates among us, be moſt culpable, it's hard determining: The ſad conſequences were ſo obvious, that great importunity fail'd to encline my undertaking our vindication, though the charge againſt us is great, and the proof attempted from miſtaken principles.

But ſeeing the Author with others judged a reply needful, and repreſented our ſilence as turned to our reproach; I am perſwaded to preface the enſuing Book, wherin thou wilt find both evidence and candor.

I ſhall only hint at what the Book is concerned in, and inſiſt on ſome Criminations the Author overlooks.

M: K's. excluding us from the Catholick Church can harm us little when he gives us a diſcription of this Church ſo entirely Popiſh, and oppoſite to the joynt teſtimony of Proteſtants, in a controverſy betwixt the Romaniſts and us. The Articles of the Church of Ireland define the Catholick Church S. 68: of the Church.

4. Bel: de Eccl: milit: lib: 3: Cap: 2. *in the Creed, to be the invisible body of Elected Saints in heaven and earth. But all of M:* K's. *description, is* Bellarmines *own who strangely confounds a particular* Church *with the Catholick Church visible, out of which particular Churches are formed; unless you admit Infidels for Members: and into which they are resolved; unless they cease to be* Catholick *Members when their Pastors dy or remove. Wheras M:* K. *might have known that the Catholick visible Church as entitive is made up of professing* Christians, *and particular Churches are but secondary members of this body as Organical by Aggregation.*

But the Dissenters *will deny his charge by further proving that they are subjects to their lawfull Pastors, that such are not their Pastors whom he chargeth them with separation from; And they can justify their Seperation to be a duty, and so no bar to their Catholick privileg if they had some times been subject to such. Tea it's manifest, the Church of* England *account us within the* Pale *of the Church; by her calling us Brethren departed in the Faith when dead, and too oft Excommunicating us when alive. His charge of Ecclesiastical Rebellion cannot yet affect us, when we think that we justly deny the Convocation to be a fit Representative of all the Pastors in* England; *and not a Supreme power over all our Churches, yea and suspect a definition of the Catholick Church by such regent Officers, as what favours the Universal Headship, and may well end in the* Pope *as* principium unitatis.

His positiveness in our duty to be silent when suspended, without regard to justice of the ground of it, imports he hath forgotten that Casuists generally determin, that an unjust sentence bindes not before God or the Church; and that Pastors power in the church is not of the same extent as a Kings in the State, but under the limits of many more instituted laws. But these matters being debated in the book I proceed.

M: K's *Sarcasm against our cant from M:* M's. *allusion to a plain scripture* p. 13 *may call him to suspect* what spirit himself is of (*Luke* 9. 55.) *and others of his sort who redicule scripture passages though used in the sence of the spirit that inspired the writers of the scriptures and condemn in us those principles, which were the common sence of Protestant Bishops, but yet these must be the only Protestant Successors, because they keep up the ceremonies tho they despise many important doctrines which they more vallued themselves by.*

Reader

Reader, thou maiſt wonder how M: K. that affirmeth no miniſters may reform no nor preach againſt the Eſtabliſht Church; can publiſh theſe thoughts of his ſo repugnant to the ſence of the Church, and undertake to reform the very Catholick Church *by a definition of it ſo oppoſite to that his* Church *hath publiſhed.*

He Reproacheth us with the favours we now recieve from men of M: M's. perſwaſion. We thankfully own the Kings Favours without ungrateful enquiries into the grounds of it, nor yet doubting but we ſhall take care not to forfeit what he thinks meet to grant. But why ſhould you that diſlike an Inquiſition *grudg us a little eaſe? I believe you are not for blaming the Magiſtrate when the Rods and Axes are diſuſed. Are not the miſeries great enough which we have endured at your hands for refuſing to ſin in doing things, which you had nothing but the bare authority of the impoſer to plead for? But I heartily wiſh all our hardſhips ſo forgoten by us as that they neither abate charity nor prevent union on Chriſtian Catholick terms.* *M:* K. P: 39. Reply.

I confeſs it's no ſmall amazement to hear the Prelatiſts reflect on the preſent liberty of Diſſenters. Are we blameable for meeting now we do it with ſafty, when we ſuffered ſo much rather than forbear it? Can they that have refuſed Preferments, endured priſons, reproach and loſs of eſtates for their principles be ſuſpected apt to renounce or betray them for a ſmile?

How can theſe men that t'other day reſolved all law into the Kings meer will, now brand our meetings as unlawful? But this will convince the world, that that party will allways Skrew up the point of Loyalty, *whoſe Intereſt the* Government *promotes; and yet may challenge their own ſentiments when the* Throne *is leſs auſpicious.*

Finally why will theſe perſons thus clamor, as if they bewailed they had loſt an opportunity to inflict the ſame evils, by the interpoſal of a power we might well have expected leſs kindneſs from? Have we any thing but immunity from puniſhment? Do we enjoy your preferments or places? Is it no favour you reap whilſt you enjoy your Revenues, and publick opportunities of ſervice? you will eſteem it ſo, and more pitty others, if ever you come to endure the penury, hazard and contempt of other faithfull Miniſters; which tho I ſuggeſt in order to a more ſober judgment; yet I deſire never to behold.

M. K. p. 72. *M. K. Brands us as friends to the Popiſh Party.*

Reply. Through the weakneſs of the Clergy this ſilly reproach is propagated among the people the falſhood wherof time may diſcover more than a preſent flaſh of heat for low intereſts can do.

But wherin lyeth this friendſhip, unleſs that you will not ſuffer us to be friends with you, and therfore you conclude we muſt needs be one with them; I heartily wiſh all could acquit themſelves of culpable friendſhip with them as we can. I am ſure we agree not in principles with them in any thing wherin we differ from you, and we blame you for nothing, but wherin you agree with them. Let us reform your Church, and We promiſe we will remove nothing but what is Popiſh; Let them reform your Church, and i'le engage they'l take away nothing but what is Preſbyterian. Do you condemn us for any thing but that which Popery would relieve us in? is it we that bow to the Eaſt, and to the Altar? do we uſe vain pageantry in Conſecrating of Churches, and utenſils, baptiſeing them with ſaints names? Do we friſk from place to place in reading our Service, uſe the ſign of the Croſs, kneel at the Sacrament, which never obtained in the Church before Tranſubſtantiation? Have we Abſolution of ſins to the uncenſured? Is private Communion our manner? Have we Organs, Singing-boys, unſcriptural Confirmation, preaching Deacons, Reading over the Dead, Holy days, Surpluſes, Reſponſa's and twenty more appendants to worſhip? The *Romiſh Church* hath all theſe; wheras we worſhip God without all this ſtuff added to *Goſpel inſtitutions*, and are content with that that for decency, the contrary wherto is indecent by natural light or common uſage.

Further whether moſt countenanceth the univerſal Headſhip your Dioceſſans or our plain Preſbyter? Have we *Deans* and *Chapters*, *Chancellors* of *Biſhops-Courts* (the prime managers of Diſcipline) Pluralities &c.

What common intereſt can we have with them, unleſs as ſubjects to the ſame *King*? & how little ſome of the N. *Conformiſts* befriended their intereſt theſe very men lately reproacht us with, and its Chriſtian and Generous in his Majeſty to overlook.

Few conſidering men will think, that we who have endured ſo much under you for diſlike to the remains of Popery; will eſpouſe that

that Church Form, where we must meet with all your fau't, and much greater. Nor is it probable we should do any thing unbecoming sincere and discerning Protestants, though we profess due Loyalty, both from Conscience, and from Grateful Resentments.

What then can be the matter? that while the *Hind* commends you as next of kin; your worship, practices, Constitutions, yea Doctrines of late do so exceed in Harmony with the Popish party above Us; while Mr: *M.* tells you their Flowers are your ornament, yea the world knoweth they love most of you & your wayes better than us; and many of your own proclaim, they would be *Papists* rather than *Presbyterians*; that yet we must still in talk, Sermons and Print, have this character of great friendship fastned on us. It seemeth to have its rise from this, you had cast us out of all places, and possessed them your selves, whereby you apprehend us now less envied, and so less exposed to the first attack of Covetousness or ambition in your rivals. But is it fair in you, first to set us below envy, and then fret that we are not made a sacrifice to preserve your grandure?

I shall conclude these remarks I have made on M. *K's* unseasonable provocations; with my hearty prayers to God that he would discover to the Church of *England*, and to us whatever our mistakes have been, that by his present dealings, he would dispose us to true repentance for our foolish as well as sinful heats, and our valuing any interest above Christs: and that he would give all a more truly Catholick spirit, which will be found the serviceable as well as Christian temper; and is so needful to revive the bleeding interest of Religion among us. That I may contribute my mite to this, and the peace, which would result therefrom, permit me to hint.

1. The terms imposed on the Nonconformists were amazingly severe, and certain to make the number of the scrupulous considerable.

No Church under heaven, except the popish, ever imposed assent and Consent to so many disputable things. We must solemnly assent to many Doctrines we cannot own; and to many practices

practices which we always ſcrupled, and much more their revival after they were once removed. We muſt be reordained, we muſt ſolemnly declare the covenant bound no man, when as a vow it muſt bind to all that was lawful in it; and we know ſome who were *ſui juris* when they took it. we muſt ſwear never to endeavour alteration in the Church as eſtabliſhed, whereas it owns in its preface to the curſes in the *liturgy*, that its Diſcipline is defective: and we believe the ſame of many other things, to ſay nothing of the many diſorders apparent in it.

The *Presbyterians* on the Kings return propoſed to uſe the *Liturgy* with ſome amendments, and to ſubmit to the Model of Epiſcopacy, drawen up by the peaceable Biſhop *Uſher*; but availed not.

2. The Conſequences of the diviſions produced by theſe ſevere terms, have been diſmal. How much of mens Miniſtry hath been waſted on theſe matters, which might have been employed to more edifying purpoſes? the prophane have had an engine to exert their inbred emnity againſt the ſerious. Was it not come to that paſs, that one was jeered as a *Phanatick*, if he dared not to be prophane? Yea under the ſhaddow of zeal againſt *Nonconformiſts*, men became light in their graveſt employs, Heterodox in their notions, and too many did ridicule all Religion in the moſt probable evidences of it, as *Cant* and *Hypocriſy*. What need I enlarge any more. Were the things contended, for by the impoſer valuable, ſo as to countervail the leaſt of theſe miſchiefs?

3. It is neceſſary for Church and State, that the union of Miniſters and communion of Sts. be provided for, on more comprehenſive terms.

All our ſtudy and prayers back'd with ſore hardſhips, have not, nor ever can bring us to comply with theſe, the Churches ſtrongeſt arguments for them be, that they are indifferent and ſurely the Churches neceſſity will at laſt convince her thats a poor Plea: Religion muſt decay, and the ſtrength of the Church will abate, whilſt the number of Diſſenters is ſo great. Groſs errors will prevail much while Diſſenter is the common odious name of all; and bad men will influence, when the

terms

terms of union are ſo hard, as to exclude the good. Let the terms of peace be once ſuch, that wiſe and good men need not ſcruple; and ſeparation will grow ſo odious a name as will expoſe the guilty, were the tolerable entertain'd, how would love flouriſh, and all be uſefull to the Churches real intereſt? ſhall we then provoke God to deſert us by our quarrels, and looſe the very name of *Proteſtant*, by contending for things that are of no uſe to us either as proteſtants or Chriſtians?

The Kingdoms intereſt concurr's as an argument to it. Where could be the policy of cutting off ſo conſiderable a part of the nation from ſervicableneſs to the ſtate, becauſe they could not agree to ſome forms. Which had no influence to make them good Chriſtians, or good Subjects. Strange was the impreſſion of the Clergy, (or ſome others) that the fitteſt man muſt not ſerve the State, if he ſcrupled the Croſs in Baptiſm. Tho I am no Erraſtian, yet I cannot but perſwade the Magiſtrate, not to interrupt trade, harraſe his Subjects, keep his Treaſures empty, give his enemies the advantage of a diſcontented party, tempt them to irregularities and diſlikes of his Government; and all this for ſome Oathes and Ceremonies valluable only as the outworks of exceſſive grandure, or a diſtinguiſhing mark between them that fear an Oath, and them that fear it too little.

May not we expect the Government to ſay in due time, it can be no ſin againſt God, to take away thoſe things which the lovers of them call indifferent; and therefore cannot quarrel againſt the removall of, nor ſeperate if they be removed. It is not our intereſt to keep out ſo great a body of Diſſenters, whoſe compliance it is vain to expect, when they ſuffered ſo many years teſtifying againſt them as ſinful: Let therefore the peace of the Church, and proſperity of the State be provided for, by things of more moment, and leſs diſputable.

4. The terms that would be comprehenſive of the moſt conſiderable part of Diſſenters, are neither difficult nor dangerous.

It was not peaceable or prudent Suggeſtion, that every little change is fatal; tho mens intereſt do not tempt them to make it ſo. Muſt the body die, if the hair or nails be par'd? I will not dare

to make propoſals ſo unſeaſonably; But I think it eaſy to demonſtrate, that no greater a change is needful than will conſiſt with decency in worſhip, reſtraint of fundamental errors, the Churches peace and trueſt glory, the Magiſtrates tranquil ſecurity, and the juſt credit and power of the Clergy.

Its our temper or ſelfiſh reſpects, not our differences, which have kept us ſo long aſunder. Could we but ſtoop leſs than our Lord's example calls us to, when he waſh'd his Diſciples feet, the debates would ſoon be at an end. Were we weaned from the love of Dominion, which he expreſly forbids, and inſpired with that love he declares ſo eſſential to his followers: it were impoſſible for us to unchurch each other, who can ſubſcribe all the Articles of the Church of *Ireland*, and all the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of *England*; as we can and will do.

I might hope a little prudence (which God ſeems about to furniſh us all with) could not fail to make us one; in the mean while, & as fit means conducive to it, let us attend to our more needful work, valuing each others as Chriſtian ſocieties, tho under ſome pardonable miſtakes.

That God would ſhew all of us the pattern of his houſe, and eſtabliſh us in his truth, is the prayer of him, who longeth to ſee peace within the gates of *Zion*, owneth all for Catholick members who are baptized viſible Chriſtians, tho fixed in no particular Church, and ſo not ſubject to any ſtated Paſtors: bleſſeth God for our reformation, tho inſtruments might be culpable; acknowledgeth all Chriſtian ſocieties to be Churches, where the Word is truly preached, and Sacraments adminiſtred, by duly qualified Paſtors, tho a Canonical right be diſputable; ſo that no contradictory thing be added which diſſolves their Church-ſtate, and dare not exclude from the Catholick Church forreign Proteſtants, who reformed by God's word, tho without the conſent of the major part of a corrupt Clergy: yea, will not ſtake the Reformation in our Lands on a caſting Vote in the *Convocation*, but its correſpondency to Chriſt's rules; who alone is ſupreme Ruler in his houſe; and by whoſe laws the fidelity of his Stewards, and their actings is determined.

SIR,

SIR,

I Have according to your desire perus'd D. *Manby's* Considerations, and Mr. *King's* Answer, and shall here give you my thoughts of them.

For the *D's* Considerations, I never imagined the Protestant Cause in any danger by so weak an Assault. If these be the strongest reasons he has to produce, he seems to be as yet but a *Novice* in the Roman School, and arriv'd no higher than the young fry of *Missionarys* whom the *Fathers* furnish with such Questions as these to accost ignorant people with. There is nothing in that Paper but what more learned Champions for the Church of *Rome* have more plausibly urg'd, and our Protestant Divines both at home and abroad as solidly refuted. So that it seem'd to me a needless expence of time to repeat the Answers so often given to those Questions, because Mr. *M.* was pleased to ask them over again. And I should have been still of that mind, if Mr. *K's* Answer had not alter'd my thoughts. 'Tis indeed judicious and clear enough wherever he defends the Church of *England* upon those principles which are common to her with other Reformed Churches; but where his narrow affection to a Party has byast his judgment, he has unhappily founded the justice of the Reformation on such principles as are only calculated for the vindication of the Church of *England*, and (what is much worse) such as cast disingenuous Reflections upon the rest of the Reformed Churches. I shall therefore in these *Remarks* suggest such truly *Catholick Principles* as justify all the Reformed Churches both as to their Reformation, and their claim to be a true part of the Catholick Church; which, if I mistake not, Mr. *K's* as well as Mr. *M's* Paper wou'd exclude some of them from; for the Notions of the one as well as the other turn the Catholick Church into a Sect, and are injurious to Christian Charity in its due extent, tho not both in an equal degree. And I undertake this the more willingly, because 'tis truly Catholick principles must cement the affecti-

ons of Proteſtants, and diſpoſe them to as near an union in practice as can be expected under the unavoidable differences of our Judgment about matters of leſs importance. And in purſuance of this deſign, I ſhall follow the order of Mr. *K*'s Anſwer, who puts D. *M*'s Paper into all the method 'tis capable of, and only take notice of thoſe Anſwers wherein Mr. *K*'s either Judgment or Charity ſeems to fail him.

The 1ſt. Queſt. propoſed by D. *M.* in his Preface is,

What is meant by the Catholick Church?

Mr. *K*'s Anſwer is, *'Tis the whole body of men profeſſing the Religion of Chriſt, and living under their lawful ſpiritual Governors*, p. 4.

There is no doubt he intends this for the deſcription of the Catholick Church here on earth, as meaſured by a judgment of charity, and compriſing all credible profeſſors of the Chriſtian Religion. Here are two characters to diſtinguiſh the Members of it, *Profeſſing the Religion of Chriſt*, and *Living under lawful ſpiritual Governors.*

Now that which I chiefly diſlike in this deſcription is, that this latter mark of the Catholick Church [*Living under lawful ſpiritual Governors*] gives us a Notion of it not only very *obſcure*, but too *narrow*. Nor does he find any ſuch mark aſſign'd either in that Text he quotes, 4 *Eph.* 3, 4, 5. or in that paſſage he cites out of St. *Auguſtin.* And 'tis the more neceſſary to inſiſt on this, becauſe every Notion of the Catholick Church, which is too narrow, is ſo far *ſchiſmatical*; for it cuts off thoſe from their relation to the Catholick Church who are members of it, and Mr. *K.* himſelf does afterwards apply it to that ill purpoſe.

That this Notion of the Catholick Church is too *narrow* (on ſuppoſition Mr. *K.* mean no better than he ſpeaks) is hence evident, becauſe there are many who are true members of the Catholick Church who live under no Paſtors or ſpiritual Governors at all, nor indeed have the opportunity to do ſo. What does he think of many Chriſtians that live in ſome forreign Plantations where they are not furniſh'd with them. Nay, to propoſe an Inſtance much more conſiderable. What does Mr. *K.* think

think of all the Proteſtants who are yet in *France*, and becauſe they will not change their Religion, are confin'd to Galleys, Priſons, or Convents? Are all theſe, by the baniſhment of their Miniſters, exc'uded from the Catholick Church? Has the *French* King's *Edict* ſo malignant an influence as to cut them off from the body of Chriſt, by depriving them of their lawful Paſtors? If ſo, Popiſh Princes have a very formidable power, and Proteſtants may well dread their *Edicts* upon a *Spiritual* as well as *Temporal* account more than all the *Thunders* of the *Vatican*

But I fear Mr. *K.* would ſcarce allow the Reformed Churches in *France* to be any part of the *Catholick Church* if they had their Paſtors again: if we compare this deſcription of it with other paſſages in his Anſwer. For this deſcription is very *obſcure*; and, if I conjecture right, Mr. *K*'s Notion of lawful ſpiritual Governors much more *narrow*.

What does he mean by *Lawful Spiritual Governors*? Are they to be eſtimated ſuch by the *Law of the Land*, or by the *Laws* of the *Church*, or by the *Law of Chriſt*?

Does he mean ſuch ſpiritual Governors as are eſtabliſht in every Nation by the *Authority* of the *Civil Magiſtrate*? If ſo, then the *Arrian* Biſhops when eſtabliſht by the Emperors of their opinion were the only lawful Paſtors, and all that part of the people that adher'd to their Orthodox Paſtors ceaſt to be members of the Catholick Church. Then the *Popiſh* Clergy in *France* are the only lawful *Spiritual Governors*, and the Proteſtants there are no part of the *Catholick Church*; becauſe they ſeparate from them. And ſhou'd the *Popiſh* Clergy be eſtabliſht in theſe Kingdoms by Law, all that ſhou'd adhere to their Proteſtant Paſtors (even thoſe whom Mr. *K.* now thinks their only *lawful ones*) wou'd ceaſe to be members of the body of Chriſt. So that the ſupreme Magiſtrate might make Paſtors *lawful* or *unlawful* at his pleaſure, and make thoſe that are this *month* members of the Catholick Church ceaſe to be ſo the next. But this is a Principle I wou'd hope fitter for Mr. *Hobbs* than for Mr. *K.* to defend.

Is it then the *Laws* of the *Church* that muſt determine who

are the *lawful* Paſtors? If this be his Notion of them (as his following diſcourſe wou'd incline one to think); What *Church* does he mean, whoſe Laws muſt determine this great debate? If the *Univerſal* Church? I know none can make Laws to oblige all the members of it but Chriſt himſelf, whom Mr. *K.* grants to be the *only* Head of it, *p.* 55. And how ſhou'd we know the ſenſe of the univerſal Church in this matter, when there has been no *General Council* theſe many hundred years, nay when there never was any ſuch thing at all. The largeſt *Councils* that Church-Hiſtory records, being ſummon'd by the *Roman* Emperors, whoſe *Mandates* cou'd not reach the *extra-Imperial* Churches. What is this Church then whoſe Laws or Judgment muſt determine who are lawful Paſtors? Is it every *National* Church? If ſo, 'tis a difficult matter to know what that is. For unleſs Mr. *K.* wou'd give ſuch a ſchiſmatical Notion of it, as the Papiſts give of the Catholick Church, it muſt include all the particular Chriſtians and particular Societies of ſuch within the bounds of that Nation, who profeſs the true Chriſtian Religion in all its eſſentials, (for all true Churches do not profeſs it in equal purity). Such a National Church is not of divine Inſtitution, and is indeed only a combination of Churches as united under one Civil Sovereign. Its true Notion lyes not in any combination purely Eccleſiaſtical and Intrinſecal, but Civil and Extrinſecal. As the true *National Church* of *England* (unleſs we will confine the name to a Sect or Party) denotes all the Churches in *England* as united under one *King* that has a civil Supremacy over them. But what if in the ſame Nation there be a diviſion about ſome diſputable Doctrine as betwixt *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts* in the dominions of ſeveral *German Princes*, or about Church-Government and modes of Worſhip, *&c.* as in theſe Nations? What if the ſeveral particular Churches according to theſe differences in their judgment fix under different Paſtors? Who are the *Church* whoſe Laws muſt decide this debate about lawful Paſtors? Is it ſuch an Aſſembly of the Clergy as our *Convocation*? But what if both Parties have ſuch Aſſemblys? Is it that Party of the Clergy which the Civil Magiſtrate does eſtabliſh and not the other,

other, then the Civil Magiſtrate may in *Germany* make *both* the *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts* lawful Paſtors, and here *both* the *Conformiſts* and the *Nonconformiſts*, nay and *unmake* them at his pleaſure, and ſo make their Churches a part or no part of the Catholick Church. Nay, if this be true, then in *France* the general Aſſembly of the Popiſh Clergy muſt determine who are lawful *Paſtors*, and were the Proteſtant Miniſters there now, for the people to adhere to them wou'd not only be *unlawful*, but (what is worſe) ſuch a *Sin* as would cut them off from the Catholick Church. And does Mr. *K.* really think ſo? What, wou'd they ceaſe to be the ſubjects of Chriſt becauſe they prefer thoſe Paſtors who teach his Doctrine, and adminiſter his Sacraments, and diſcipline according to the Rules of the Goſpel, before thoſe who groſsly *corrupt* them, and *impoſe* thoſe corruptions? He muſt have a very odd underſtanding that can aſſent to ſo *ſenſeleſs*, not to ſay ſo *wicked*, an aſſertion: For this were no better than to ſet up a point of meer human *Order* in oppoſition to the intereſt of *Truth* and *Holineſs*. I might here inſtance again in the *Arrian* Biſhops, who had not only the countenance of the Emperors, but got Imperial Councils (call'd General, as that of *Armini* and *Syrmium*) on their ſide; and according to this Principle, they were the only lawful Paſtors, and thoſe that ſeparated from them were no part of the Catholick Church.

I know not how Mr *K.* will like theſe conſequences; But he cannot avoid them, unleſs he will ſay, That where there are in a Nation two divided parties of Chriſtians fixt under different Paſtors, thoſe are the only lawful Paſtors who are on the ſide of Truth in the Points controverted betwixt them, whether they have the *Civil Magiſtrates* countenance or no. And if he ſay this, 'twill follow on the other hand, that in thoſe *Popiſh Kingdoms* where there are any *Proteſtant Miniſters*, they are the only lawful Paſtors, and the *Popiſh Churches* that live not under them no part of the Catholick Church. Nay, in thoſe parts of *Germany* where there are *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts*, if the *Calviniſts* be in the right, the *Lutherans* for ſeparating from the *Calviniſt* Miniſters, forfeit all relation to the *Catholick Church.*

Church. And to add no more, if the *Non-Conformiſts* be in the right in the matters debated betwix them and the *Conformiſts* about Church-Government, &c. they are the only lawful Paſtors, and the *Prelatical Churches* no part of the *Catholick Church.*

Or laſtly, Muſt the *Laws* of *Chriſt* determine who are lawful *Paſtors?* then thoſe are the only lawful ſpiritual Governors in his *Church* whoſe *Office* he has inſtituted, who have all the *Qualifications* requir'd, 1 *Tim.* 3. *ch.* 1 *Tit.* Who are *ordain'd* to their Office by ſuch as he has entruſted the power of *Ordination* to, (where ſuch *Ordination* can be had) and who have the *conſent* of that *Flock* they take the overſight of. If theſe be the laws of *Chriſt* (as it were eaſy to prove if that were deny'd) then all *Dioceſan Prelates* muſt be caſhier'd from the number of lawful Paſtors, unleſs they can prove their Office inſtituted by Chriſt, and ſo muſt all the *Pariſh*-Miniſters who want the Qualifications mention'd, 1 *Tim.* 3. or who are impos'd on the people without their conſent, nay, too often againſt it. And if Mr. *K*'s Notion of the *Catholick Church* be true, then all the Churches that live under Dioceſan Prelates as their ſpiritual Governors, or ſuch unqualifi'd obtruded Pariſh-Miniſters, are no part of the *Catholick Church.* So that if he retract not this new deſcription of the *Catholick Church*, 'tis like to fall heavy on his own Party; and becauſe I would not be ſo uncharitable to the Church of *England*, as he is to the *Churches* of Diſſenters, I adviſe him the next time he undertakes to define the *Catholick Church*, to leave out this *dangerous* mark of it. At leaſt he ought to apply this mark to the *Papiſts* as well as *Diſſenters*; whereas among the Latin Queſtions; The 14*th* is, *Whether that be a true Church which has not lawful Paſtors? And Mr.* K. *thus anſwers, It may be a true Church, witneſs the Church of* Rome, *which has had ſo many hæretical, ſchiſmatical, ſimoniacal ones, who were not all lawful Paſtors; But did there therefore ceaſe to be a Church at* Rome? But I perceive this is a true *mark* when he would vent his ſpleen againſt the Presbyterian Churches at home and abroad, but a *falſe* or *uncertain* one when it would unchurch the Papiſts. The beſt of it is, if it be a true *mark*, the Papal and Dioceſan Churches are moſt concern'd in the dangerous conſequences of it. All

All therefore I ſhall add on this Head, is a brief Anſwer to Mr. *M*'s Queſtion, What that Holy *C*atholick and Apoſtolick *C*hurch is which we profeſs to believe in the Creed?

Anſw. We need go no farther for the reſolution of this Queſtion, than the Text quoted by Mr. *K.* 4 *Eph.* 3, 4, 5. Only I muſt premiſe, that the *Catholick Church* in its true extent includes the *C*hurch Triumphant as well as the *C*hurch Militant; nay, all the Saints that have been, are, or ſhall be on earth to the end of the world; ſee Mr. *Claud*'s *Reponſe au livre de Monſr: l'*Eveſq; *de* Meaux, *&c. p.* 7, 8, 9, *&c.* But if we ſpeak of the *Catholick Church* as militant on earth, it muſt be conſidered either as meaſured by the *judgment* of *God*, which diſcerns the truth of things from all hypocritical diſguiſes, or as meaſur'd by the *judgment* of humane *Charity*. As meaſur'd by the judgment of God, 'tis according to the fore-quoted Text, *One body or ſociety animated by one holy Spirit, having one heavenly hope, ſubjected to one Lord Jeſus, believing the ſame revealed Doctrine as to all neceſſary Articles, and devoted by one Baptiſmal Covenant to one heavenly Father.* This Body is call'd *Inviſible*, or *Myſtical*, from that internal Faith and Holineſs which are inviſible; and 'tis alſo *Viſible* by the external profeſſion of that true Faith and Holineſs. And this is that Church which we profeſs to believe in the Creed, in which alone we can expect to find the true Communion of Saints; And to this Church alone all promiſes of ſaving Bleſſings are made in the holy Scriptures. * But the Catholick *C*hurch, as meaſur'd by the *judgment of human Charity*, comprizes all that make a credible profeſſion of *C*hriſtian Faith and Holineſs. For we are incapable to diſtinguiſh the true and living members of the *C*hurch from thoſe that only appear to be ſo. And therefore the *C*atholick *C*hurch, as eſtimated by our charity, is more *large* and *comprehenſive* than the *real* Body of *C*hriſt. For *Hypocrites* are no true members of his Body, tho mixt with them in the ſame external Society by their external Profeſſion; or as St. *John* diſtinguiſhes, they are among them, but not *of them*, 1 *Joh.* 2. *v.* 19. They are but *blaſted* Ears, not the true *Wheat*; they are members of the *C*hurch *C*atholick in

* *The judgment of ſeveral Fathers to this purpoſe, and particularly St: Aug: ſee quoted in that fore-cited diſcourſe of Mr: Claud from p: 45 to 68:*

in *appearance*, not in *reality*. The Church Catholick, as measur'd by our charitable judgment, is I know commonly call'd the Church-Catholick-Visible, *i.e.* the Church Catholick, as estimated by an external or visible profession. But I wou'd choose rather for avoiding confusion, to call it the Visible Church Catholick mixt: For the Church Catholick in the proper sense, (as constituted of its living, or as the Schools speak, its univocal members, real Saints) is also *Visible*, because its members not only *believe with the heart, but confess with the mouth to salvation*, as the Apostle *Paul* speaks, *Rom.* 10. *v.* 10. But these real Saints do not make up one *distinct* external society by themselves, but as mixt with a crowd of Hypocrites, who joyn with them in the same external profession of Christianity; Nor are they exactly distinguishable from Hypocrites in our Judgment, which cannot pierce into the hearts of men, and only looks at the credibility of their external profession. If therefore it be enquir'd, what is the true Catholick Church? We must answer, All sincere Christians, who are *one* body or society by their belief of, and subjection to Jesus Christ their common Head and center of Unity. If it be enquir'd, whom should we in charity judge to be members of the Catholick Church, the Answer is obvious; All that make a credible profession of that Faith and that subjection. If it be askt further, what is a credible profession? 'tis answer'd, A profession not contradicted by notorious ignorance of the *essentials* of Christianity, by *fundamental Errors*, or by *notorious wickedness*. And he that would prove any particular Church or Churches, that call themselves Christian, to be no parts of the Catholick Church, must prove that they deny, or at least do not profess some essential Article of the Christian Faith, or are notoriously ungodly. (I add notoriously ungodly, because subjection to the laws of Christ is as necessary to our being the true members of his Church, as belief of his Doctrine; and consequently a credible profession of that subjection, as requisite to our being esteemed such). And therefore D. *M.* has very little reason to value himself upon this Question: And the Church of *Rome* has so little reason to arrogate to her self the Title of the

the Church Catholick, that a man muſt be very charitable to allow her to be a *part* of it; but no wiſe man will allow her to be any other than the moſt *corrupt and unſound part of it.* For that Church has gone ſo near towards the ſubverting the eſſential truths and laws of Chriſtianity by their dangerous corruptions in Doctrine, Worſhip and Practice, that it wou'd be the beſt *ſervice* D. *M.* can do her, to demonſtrate clearly that there is a credible profeſſion of Chriſtianity left amongſt thoſe that practically hold all the Deciſions of the *Council of Trent, exempl. gr.* To reconcile that Doctrine of their Council, that *imperfect Contrition or Attrition is ſufficient to diſpoſe a man for Abſolution in the Sacrament of Penance,* Council of *Trent, Seſſ.* 4. *cap.* 4. with that neceſſary Doctrine of the Goſpel, *Without Repentance there is no Remiſſion of Sins.* To reconcile the worſhip of the Church of *Rome* with the ſecond Commandment, is a task well worthy of D. *M*'s pains. But I hope in many that live in the communion of the Church of *Rome*, the common principles of Chriſtianity which they retain, prevail againſt the poyſonous additions of *Popery*; and all the Doctrines of that and other Councils are not practically held by them. But their claim to be a part of the Church Catholick is not near ſo clear and indiſputable as that of the Reformed Churches, whoſe Doctrine and Worſhip compar'd with the holy Scriptures, evidence them to be an incomparably ſounder part of it; tho even all the Reformed Churches are not equal in their ſoundneſs and purity.

This Catholick Church hath only one univerſal Head Jeſus Chriſt, and is one Body only on the account of its union with, and ſubjection to him. Nor is there any *Vicarious* univerſal Head under Chriſt to which the Government of the Church Catholick is committed, whether *Pope, General, Council,* or *Colledge* of *Prelates*; Nor can any ſuch humane Head make Laws obligatory to the univerſal Church. For any to pretend to it is an uſurpation of Chriſt's Legiſlative power; and 'tis chiefly on the account of that *Uſurpation,* and employing that uſurped power to deprave the Church, and deſtroy its ſoundeſt members, that the Proteſtants have call'd the Pope *Antichriſt.*

Particular Churches are the chief integrating parts of the Church Catholick; (I ſpeak of it here as meaſur'd by the judgment of charity). As to any of theſe particular Churches, if the Queſt. be, Are they a part of the Catholick Church? It muſt be reſolv'd by the credibility of their Chriſtian Profeſſion. If the Queſtion be, Are they Churches *regularly* conſtituted or organiz'd? 'Tis in the reſolution of this Queſt. We muſt conſider, whether they be a ſociety of Chriſtians united under one or more ſuch Paſtors as Chriſt has appointed, for perſonal communion in Faith, Worſhip and holy living; and whether their Paſtors were in a *regular* manner ſet over them. And here the diſpute about *lawful ſpiritual Governors* muſt come in. For that a particular *Church* have a *lawful Paſtor*, is not abſolutely neceſſary to its being a true Church, and conſequently a true part of the Catholick Church (as Mr. *K.* himſelf acknowledges in the fore-quoted place, *p.* 90. tho how he will reconcile that Conceſſion with his deſcription of the Catholick Church, I do not underſtand): 'Tis only neceſſary to its being a *Church* regularly conſtituted. And who are ſuch lawful Paſtors, there will be occaſion to diſcuſs in anſwer to the 4*th* Queſt.

The ſecond Queſt. is, Whether by the *C*hurch *C*atholick be meant the *C*hurch of *England* alone, or the *C*hurch of *England* in communion with other *C*hurches?

Mr. *K.* well replys, The *C*hurch of *England* is no more the *C*atholick *C*hurch, than the *Britiſh Seas* are the whole *Ocean*. But he does ill to found its being a part of the *C*atholick *C*hurch on its ſubjection to Catholick Biſhops. I ſuppoſe he means Dioceſan Biſhops. For it wou'd not ceaſe to be a part of the catholick *C*hurch, if it ſhou'd diſown Dioceſan Prelacy. And if Mr. *K.* think otherwiſe, he has theſe two difficult Propoſitions to prove; Firſt, that Jeſus *C*hriſt has inſtituted the Office of Dioceſan Prelates in his church; and ſecondly, that he has made ſuch Prelates the center of catholick Unity, and ſubjection to them neceſſary to our being members of the catholick church. Now if Mr. *K.* will undertake the defence of theſe two Propoſitions, he not only unchurches all the Reformed

formed Churches that want Dioceſan Prelacy, but even the Catholick Church it ſelf for a *Century* or two at leaſt, as I offer to evince, if Mr *K.* pleaſe to demand it. For communion with other Churches, it muſt be underſtood in the eſſentials of Chriſtian Religion; for it can ſcarce be expected in all its *integrals in this imperfect ſtate, but much leſs in unneceſſary humane additions to Chriſtianity: And we muſt not confound communion with ſubjection; the former may be due where the latter is not.*

The third Queſt. is, With what other Church does the Church of *England* communicate in Sacraments and Liturgy?

Mr. *K.* well anſwers, That *Unity* in *Liturgy* is no part of communion of Churches; and that the Church of *England* (and had his charity been wide enough, he might ſafely have added alſo, the *Churches* cal'd *Presbyterian* and *Independent*) is united with all other Chriſtians in the participation of the ſame Sacraments: And I doubt not the *Presbyt.* and *Indep. Churches* adminiſter them as agreeably to our Saviours Inſtitution as any other. I come therefore to the

4*th.* Queſt. Whether by the Catholick Church be meant the variety of all *Proteſtants*, ſince they want her eſſential *mark*, Unity?

Before I conſider Mr. *K*'s anſwer to the Queſt. I ſhall *offer one that is very obvious*, and (I doubt not) more agreeable to the temper of every true Catholick and charitable Chriſtian, *viz.*

That all the Reformed Churches whoſe publick Confeſſions of Faith are extant, are true parts of the Catholick Church; tho ſome of them may be more, others leſs pure and uncorrupted. (Of *Quakers* we can make no judgment, becauſe we know not what their Opinions are, and 'tis well if they do ſo themſelves. For *Fifth-Monarchy men*, I know no diſtinct *Churches* conſtituted of them; and if they hold no other Notion of a *Fifth-Monarchy* than the learned Mr. *Mede* on the *Rev.* ſeems inclin'd to believe, I hope Mr. *K.* will not think it inconſiſtent with ſalvation.)

If *D. M.* ask where is the eſſential *mark* of the Church Catholick,

tholick, *viz. Unity* among the *Epiſcopal, Presbyt. Indep.* and *Anabapt. Churches?*

Anſw. What *Unity* does he mean? If an Unity in the eſſentials of *Chriſtian Faith* and *Holineſs*, let him name me one of theſe Churches that denys any eſſential Article of the *Chriſtian Religion*, or one Precept of the *moral Law*; nay, or one eſſential part of *Divine Worſhip*, as Praiſe, Prayer, Preaching; or one Sacrament inſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt. For tho the *Anabaptiſts* deny the Baptizing of Infants, yet they do not deny Baptiſm it ſelf; and however I may judge them miſtaken in that point, I ſhould think him more dangerouſly miſtaken that ſhould on the account of their Error in ſo intricate a controverſy condemn them as no part of the Catholick Church. I will not patronize all the irregularities that may be objected in ſome of theſe *Churches*, but my charity does oblige me to add, that they are not ſuch as invalidate the credibility of their *Chriſtian Profeſſion*, nor the thouſandth part ſo groſs as the *corruptions* of the *Greek* and *Roman Churches*.

Or does Mr. *M.* mean by Catholick Unity, an *Unity* in an humane univerſal Head of the *Church*, as *Pope* or *Council*? This is no better than an *Unity* in owning a groſs Uſurper that invades the Prerogatives of our bleſſed Lord, the only Head of his *Church*, that claims an univerſal power over his *Church*, without any commiſſion from him. Or does he mean, an Unity in all the Errors, Idolatry, Superſtition, and corrupt practices that have by degrees crept into the *Church*, and overrun any conſiderable part of it? I hope he will not make this the *mark* of the *Catholick Church's Unity*, no more than he wou'd make mens *diſeaſes* a mark of their *unity* in the *humane nature*. This is an Unity to be avoided, not courted or deſir'd. Or does he mean *an Unity in humane unneceſſary Canons* that ſhall reduce all Chriſtians to an exact uniformity in the external modes of Religion? This is an Unity never to be effected, but either by reducing mens judgments to an uniformity about thoſe matters, or by forcing them to comply with what their judgments condemn. The *former* is morally impoſſible, conſidering the different degrees of our knowledge in this imperfect

ſect ſtate on earth; and one might as wiſely attempt to bring all Nations to aſſect the ſame civil cuſtoms, ceremonies, or garb. The *latter* is a *lording it over God's heritage, and exerciſing a dominion over the Faith of Chriſtians* in the higeſt degree, which the Apoſtles themſelves diſclaim and forbid, 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. 2 *Pet.* 5. 3. An uniformity in humane rites is no unity preſcrib'd in the word of God; and conſequently not neceſſary to the conſtitution of the Catholick Church. The laws of Chriſt, which alone are obligatory to the Catholick Church, have made ſufficient proviſion for its Unity as far as 'tis attainable on earth; (for perfect Unity is the effect of the perfect light and love of Heaven). And for any ſingle perſon, or collective body of Paſtors to preſcribe other terms of Unity to the Catholick Church than Chriſt has done, is not only an uſurpation of his legiſlative power, but one of the moſt effectual methods that Hell has found out to raiſe Schiſms and Diviſions in it, and thereby to deſtroy Chriſtian love. And he that knows not how fatal an Engine the needleſs and corrupt impoſitions of ambitious Prelates and their Councils have been above theſe 1300 years to deprave and tear the Chriſtian Church, under pretence of reducing it to an impoſſible Uniformity, is either a ſtranger to Church Hiſtory, or has too deep a tincture of that wretched pride and ignorance that has animated imperious Patriarchs and Popes.

I proceed now to conſider Mr. *K*'s Anſwer to D. *M*'s Queſt. which I ſhall tranſcribe at large.

Neither are all Proteſtants Catholick Members of the Church, nor they only. Thoſe among Proteſtants that embrace the Catholick Faith, and make no ſeparation from their lawful Governors, and that live in Unity of Faith and Charity with their neighbour Churches, are catholick members; and have that unity which is eſſential to the catholick church. But theſe are not to be confounded with Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptiſts, Fifth-monarchy men, Quakers, &c. ſince theſe have ſeparated themſelves from their lawful Governors, as much as Mr: M. himſelf; though their crime be leſs than his; as he is leſs guilty that makes a rebellion, than he who joyns with a Forreigner to enſlave his countrey.

I did

I did not expect a man of Mr. *K*'s abilities cou'd have betraid ſo much *ignorance* or *uncharitableneſs*, or *both*, in anſwering ſo eaſy a Queſtion. If the *Diſſenters* be guilty of Schiſm, I am ſure 'tis not half ſo groſs and palpable as what this one Paragraph contains, nor ſo oppoſite to true chriſtian love.

Mr. *K.* who charges D. *M.* for talking of things without clearing them, would do well to take his own advice. 'Tis hard to imagine what he means by *Catholick members* of the Church. Does he mean the ſame by it, as *members of the catholick church*, or no?

If he do not, what ſignifies his Anſwer to D. *M*'s Queſtion, which was, *Whether the church catholick contain all the variety of Proteſtants who want her eſſential mark*, viz. *Unity*? Nay, why does he aſſert thoſe Proteſtants *only*, whom he here deſcribes to have that Unity which is *eſſential* to the Catholick Church? For none can be members of the Catholick Church, but ſuch as are united with their fellow members in thoſe things which *eſſentially* conſtitute them *one* Church or Body. *Catholick members* of the Church is no very proper expreſſion, 'tis like *total parts*, and can have no tolerable ſenſe diſtinct from that plainer expreſſion, *Members of the catholick church*. If Mr. *K.* make any diſtinction betwixt theſe two phraſes, it muſt be founded on the ſuppoſition of ſome vicarious Head of Unity to the Catholick Church, which we condemn the Church of *Rome* for ſetting up, and Mr. *K.* himſelf ſeems to diſown, *p.* 55. Nor wou'd that *Hypotheſis* it ſelf juſtify the diſtinction; becauſe if Chriſt have made any Vicarious Head or center of Unity to the Catholick Church, we cou'd not be united to him as his members without union with that Vicarious Head. So that to be Catholick members of the Church, and members of the Catholick Church, are the ſame thing.

And if Mr. *K.* uſe that expreſſion in this ſenſe, let us conſider a little the deſcription he gives of thoſe who are Catholick members of the Church. Here are three characters to know them by; Their *embracing the catholick Faith*, their *making no ſeparation from their lawful Governors*, their *living in charity with their neighbour churches*.

The

The firſt is, *Embracing the Catholick Faith* (and he ſhou'd have added, *Profeſſing catholick holineſs of life*). For this character 'tis undeniable, and I hope Mr. *K.* will not exclude any of the forementioned Proteſtant Churches from being Catholick members of the Church on this ſcore.

The two latter Mr. *K.* himſelf will find too dangerous and too ſchiſmatical to own upon ſecond thoughts.

For from the third, *viz. living in charity with their neighbour churches*, I infer;

1*ſt.* That this character does exclude all the *Papiſts* from being catholick members of the Church; for they are ſo far from living in charity with their neighbour Churches, that their *Trent-creed* does aſſert its Articles to be that catholick Faith without which no man can be ſaved, and conſequently damns all the Churches in the world beſides their own.

2. On ſuppoſition the Reformed Churches abroad which have not Dioceſan Biſhops, be true Churches, this character excludes all thoſe of the Church of *England* from being catholick members of the Church, who do, with Mr. *Dodwell* unchurch all thoſe Reformed Churches that want Prelatical Ordination. For to unchurch them, is not *to live in charity with them.*

3. If the Churches of the *Presbyt. and Indep.* here be true Churches, (as I ſhall in this Paper evince they are), then Mr. *K.* and all that are of his mind, are no catholick members of the Church, becauſe they live not in charity with their neighbour Churches. (And I hope there is not the leſs charity due to them for being of the ſame countrey or Nation): for Mr. *K.* makes ſubjection to lawful Paſtors a mark of the members of the catholick Church, *p.* 4. and declares the *Presbyt. &c.* deſtitute of that mark, *p.* 6. And conſequently denys them to be members of the catholick church, which is the higheſt breach of charity imaginable. And what if the *Presbyt.* ſhou'd treat Mr. *K.* according to his own principle, and declare him no catholick member, becauſe he lives not in charity with them? They would but uſe his own weapons againſt himſelf. But (however they have been miſrepreſented) they are not of that ſchiſmatical humour as ſome are, who have long made a loud outcry againſt Schiſm.

4. Nay,

4. Nay, if this character be true, then in all those contentions that have happen'd in the Church where the contending Parties have been so uncharitable as to excommunicate one another' tho sometimes about meer trifles; the one Party or both have ceast to be catholick members of the church. And so when Pope *Victor* excommunicated the *Eastern* churches for not keeping *Easter* on the same day with him, He and all that joyn'd with him ceast to be catholick members of the church. And if to be *catholick members of the Church, and members of the catholick Church* be the same, what a vast part of the christian world has been unchurch'd in every age by the uncharitable censures of proud contentious Prelates!

I suppose Mr. *K.* never considered these consequences, or else he would never have made living in charity with neighbour Churches a necessary mark of the catholick members of the Church. As if the *legitimate* children of the same Father might not in an angry mood call one another *Bastards*, or the subjects of the same King in a pievish humour nickname their fellow subjects Rebells without any just cause. I am sure, the *Presbyterian* Chnrches both at home and abroad are the least concern'd in this character; for they have never unchurcht the *Prelatical* Churches, even when they have met with the most harsh and unreasonable treatment from them.

But Mr. *K.* has given us another character to distinguish the Catholick members of the *Church* by, which he imagines will exclude all the *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, &c, from that number, *viz.*

That they are such as *make no separation from their lawful Governors.*

All this is founded on his schismatical mark of the catholick Church, *viz. That its members live under their lawful spiritual Governors.* Here therefore all those difficulties occur about the meaning of lawful spiritual Governors which were propos'd, *p.* 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. And which sense soever Mr. *K.* chooses, he will find it does oblige him to unchurch a great part of the Catholick Church, *i. e.* to be a *schismatick* of the worst sort. And if the laws of Christ must determine the debate, he will give the

Dif-

Diſſenters ſuch an Argument againſt *Prelatical* Churches being members of the Catholick, as he will never be able to anſwer: And Mr. *Baxter's Treatiſe*, which proves the *unlawfulneſs of Dioceſan Prelacy*, has, according to Mr. *K.* done what that charitable man never intended, unchurcht all our Dioceſan Churches, and caſhierd them from being any part of the *Church-Catholick*.

There is no doubt but unjuſt ſeparation from any lawful ſpiritual Governors is a ſinful practice: And particular Churches gather'd by ſuch a ſinful ſeparation, are not gather'd in a *regular* way. And therefore an unjuſt violation of due Order, is all that Mr. *K.* can juſtly pretend to charge the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* with, and perhaps will find it a more difficult task than he imagines, to make good that charge.

And therefore to clear this matter, let me premiſe; *Particular* Churches are the chief integrating parts of the Church-*Catholick*. Theſe Churches conſiſt of one or more Paſtors, and a Chriſtian Flock aſſociated under his or their overſight for *perſonal* communion in Faith, Worſhip, and holy living. Theſe Churches are obliged by the very dictates of the light of nature, and general rules of the holy Scripture, to endeavour the preſervation of all neceſſary Unity, by the amicable conſultations of their aſſociated Paſtors. The judgment of ſuch aſſociated Paſtors ſhould be ſubmitted to by the people under their care, when 'tis not repugnant to the Word of God, and contrary to the intereſt of Religion. But the people do not owe them a *blind obedience*, nor have ſuch Paſtors any power but for *edification*. Much leſs can ſuch Biſhops pretend to an higher power, whoſe very Office Chriſt never inſtituted, whoſe pretended relation to their Dioceſs is not founded on the peoples conſent to it; and if ſuch Biſhops ſhould claim the ſole power of *Church-Government* in a Nation, and exerciſe it againſt the will of Chriſt to the notorious detriment of ſoul's, (as by unjuſt ſilencing of faithful Paſtors when their labours are highly conducive to the Churches good, by impoſing on the people ſinful conditions of Church-communion, by obtruding unqualifi'd Paſtors on the people againſt their conſent, &c.) To ſeparate

from ſuch Biſhops ſo far as to diſobey theſe unjuſt commands, is no ſeparation from our lawful Governors; and is no more a *Rebellion in the Church*, than 'tis a Rebellion in the State to diſobey one that uſurps a Power he never receiv'd from the King, and which he exerciſes againſt the laws and intereſt of the Kingdom.

And therefore I would propoſe theſe two Queſtions to Mr. *K.* in reference to this Head.

Q. 1. On ſuppoſition the *Presbyt's and Indep's* have made an unjuſt ſeparation from their lawful Governors whom they ſhould have ſubmitted to, *Whether this be ſuch a crime as will exclude them from being Catholick members of the Church?*

To reſolve that, We muſt conſider the nature of their ſeparation. Their Miniſters ſeparate from the Biſhops, *i. e.* they are not willing to obey them in what they account a ſinful and dangerous uſurpation, *viz.* the aſſuming the ſole power of Church-Government, and depriving the Paſtors of particular Churches of an eſſential part of their Office, and ſuſpending them unjuſtly. Their people ſeparate from the Pariſh-Miniſters, but 'tis not by diſowning them, as no true Miniſters, but by refuſing to receive them as *theirs*, becauſe they judge they have a right to chooſe a Phyſician for their Souls as well as for their Bodies; and therefore think not themſelves bound to acquieſce in the *Patrons or Biſhops* choice, when contrary to their own edification; eſpecially when there are terms of Pariſh-communion impos'd, to ſome *unlawful*, to others greatly *ſuſpected*; and all true Church-diſcipline is caſt out or neglected. They ſeparate not from the conforming Churches as no *true* Churches, but as preferring the ordinary communion of *purer*; becauſe they judge the laws about Pariſh-order do not oblige, when injurious to the intereſt of Religion and Souls. Now ſuppoſe them miſtaken in theſe matters through the weakneſs of their judgment; will this ſort of ſeparation make them ceaſe to be *Catholick* members of the *Church*? 'Tis not a ſeparation from any thing *Chriſt* has made neceſſary to the unity of his *Church*, 'tis only a ſeparation from ſome humane order, which they dare not comply with, becauſe they appre-

apprehend it contrary to the laws of *Chriſt*. And is this to be compar'd to a Rebellion in the State? (as he is pleas'd to do, *p.* 6.) Is the convocation, *Chriſt?* or *their Canons* equally obligatory as *his laws*? or do thoſe that diſobey the *Canons* of the Convocation, becauſe they judge them oppoſite to the laws of Chriſt, renounce their Allegiance to him as the Head of his Church? Are their Canons even about things they call *indifferent*, as neceſſary to be obey'd, as the undoubted Rules of the Goſpel, by all that wou'd be *Catholick members* of the Church, when thoſe that are requir'd to obey them, fear the things commanded are unlawful? When I read ſuch expreſſions as this about *Church-Rebellion*, I cannot but lament the effects of humane ignorance and pride, and obſerve in ſuch as Mr. *K.* ſome degrees of that ſpirit that has acted Papal Councils, who made no ſcruple of treating all that would not pay them a blind obedience with ſuch characters as theſe. And I know no better way to convince Mr. *K.* of the folly of this Principle I am oppoſing, than by ſhewing him how pernicious the conſequences of it are to his own Party.

For if this ſort of Schiſm which he ſuppoſes the Diſſenters guilty of, prove them to be no Catholick members of the Church, then ſure more heinous Schiſm will prove thoſe to be in the ſame condition who are guilty of it. Greater Schiſm is more oppoſite to *Catholick Unity* than leſſer. But the *Prelates* are guilty of more heinous Schiſm than this of the *Diſſenters* (ſuppoſing it to be Schiſm); and conſequently if Mr. *K*'s principle be true, are no Catholick members of the *Church*. That the *Prelates* are guilty of more heinous Schiſm, I offer this Argument to evince. Thoſe who impoſe unneceſſary and and doubtful terms of *Church-Communion*, nay, who declare many thouſands of true Chriſtians *ipſo facto* excommunicated, are greater Schiſmaticks than thoſe, who only ſcruple thoſe terms, tho through miſtake, and who unchurch not thoſe *Churches* which they are thus forc'd to ſeparate from. For the Schiſm of the *Impoſers* is more *voluntary* and curable by forbearing to preſcribe ſuch terms of *Communion* as are more likely to prove engines of Diviſion; The Schiſm of the *Refuſers* is

more *involuntary*, and in doubtful caſes often incurable. And 'tis more oppoſite to *Chriſtian Love* to excommunicate thouſands of ſincere *Chriſtians*, than 'tis to prefer thoſe *Churches* which we upon the beſt enquiry judge more pure before thoſe that ſeem more corrupt without unchurching them; even tho in ſo doing we ſhould be guilty of ſome breach of the Churches peace, by violating a tolerable humane order: So that all Mr. *K.* will gain by excluding *Diſſenters* from the *Catholick Church* on the account of their Schiſm, will be, That by the ſame reaſon, our *Convocation* were no *Catholick members* of it; and if ſo, I am ſure they are no lawful Governors in it.

For what I have here aſſerted, that the *Convocation* have excommunicated thouſands of ſincere Chriſtians, and that *ipſo facto*, I appeal to their *Canons*, and to the conſciences of any that peruſe them, and know the *Nonconformiſts* in theſe Kingdoms, few whereof are not by ſome of theſe *Canons ipſo facto* excommunicated. See Mr. *Baxter's Engliſh Schiſmatick detected*, who from *p* 42 to the 50*th*. recites the particular *Canons*.

Nay, if all that are guilty of equal Schiſm with that of the *Diſſenters* (ſuppoſing them guilty) be no Catholick members of the Church, I fear there are few ſuch in the World. Sure the Schiſm of the *Papiſts* is of a more monſtrous nature, who unchurch all the Churches on earth beſides themſelves. And the *Greeks* pay them in the ſame coyn. And if other of the *Eaſtern* Churches do not unchurch one another, they have loſt their old wont. What dreadful work Councils have made in *hereticating* and *unchurching* one another upon very unjuſtifiable grounds, fills up both pages in *Church-Hiſtory*. And as ſuch were more heinous Schiſmaticks than thoſe that are guilty only of *paſſive ſeparation*, (*i. e.* ſeparation occaſion'd by mens ſcruples the lawfulneſs of ſome humane *Canons*); ſo according to this notion, they were no Catholick members of the Church: And at this ſenſeleſs rate we may ſoon reduce the Catholick Church to a ſmall compaſs. And what would become even of the Chriſtian World, if the compaſſions of our bleſſed Lord were as narrow as the charity of ſuch cenſorious Chriſtians.

The

The 2*d. Queſt.* I wou'd propoſe to Mr. *K.* is,

Upon what grounds does he aſſert that the Presbyterians, Independents, &c. have made a ſeparation from their lawful ſpiritual Governors?

This Queſt. relates to the regular conſtitution of their Churches; Who then are the *lawful Paſtors* of theſe *Presbyterians*, &c. from whom they have ſeparated? Does he mean the *Biſhops*, or the *Pariſh Miniſters*?

If the *Biſhops*, they muſt be conſider'd either as the *King's Officers*, to execute that civil power which he has *circa ſacra*; And ſo the *Presbyterians* ſubmit to them, and ſeparate not from them; Or they muſt be conſider'd as *Chriſts Officers*, to exerciſe that ſpiritual power which his *Charter* gives; and as ſuch, the *Presbyterians* are very ready to ſubmit to them, when they have prov'd the *divine Right* of their *Office*: Or they muſt be conſider'd as the *Churches Officers*; and if ſo, 'tis requiſite, that Church ſhould obey them, who aſſign them their Office, or conſent to be their ſubjects; not thoſe who account their Office a ſinful uſurpation, and are the more unwilling to become their Subjects, becauſe they cannot be ſo without complying with ſinful Impoſitions, and even approving their uſurpation. And that any Church may lawfully conſtitute new Officers whom Chriſt never appointed, and ſubject his undoubted Officers to their Authority, eſpecially ſuch as Dioceſan Prelates, who by engroſſing the power of the Keys, render *Church-diſcipline* impracticable, is a propoſition Mr. *K.* will hardly prove.

If the *Pariſh-Miniſters* be the *lawful Governors* they ſeparate from, I would willingly know how they come to be the *lawful Governors* or *Paſtors* to thoſe that conſent not to their Paſtoral relation, and have ſufficient reaſons why they do not? Will Mr. *K.* ſay, that all perſons ought to commit the conduct of their Souls to that Miniſter whom the *Biſhops* or *Patron* chooſes? and that 'tis ſinful ſeparation not to do ſo? I wou'd then enquire; What does he think of thoſe *Pariſhes* that are ſo large, that ſcarce the tenth part of the people can enjoy the labours of the *Pariſh-Miniſters*, as *Stepney*, *Giles*, *Martins*, and *Cripple-*

Cripplegate Pariſhes in *London*, which have one with another 30000 or 40000 ſouls in each of them? Does he think it an unlawful ſeparation for that part of the people that cannot have room in the Pariſh-Churches, to attend the Miniſtrations of other pious and judicious Paſtors? Is this ſuch a ſeparation too as will exclude them from the Catholick Church? To aſſert this, is to prefer a point of humane *order* (or rather *diſorder*) about Pariſh-bounds before the *ſalvation of ſouls*; and in effect to ſay, that 'twere better all thoſe people ſhould want the ordinary means of ſalvation, and live like *Pagans* or *Atheiſts* without any publick worſhip of God, than ſuch a point of Church-order be violated. And if any can believe all this, 'tis very much to be doubted whether they know what *ſouls* and their *ſalvation* are.

Again, What does Mr. *K.* think of ſuch Pariſh-Miniſters as want the neceſſary qualifications, ſuch as are notoriouſly ignorant, or ſcandalouſly wicked? Do thoſe in their Pariſhes, who after having ſought redreſs in vain, chooſe other Miniſters of eminent learning and holineſs, make a ſinful ſeparation, even ſuch as will argue them no Catholick members of the Church? If he ſay this, he ſtill prefers a meer point of humane order before the *end* of it, the *edification of ſouls*; and had rather hazard their damnation, than have a ſcandalous Pariſh Miniſter diſown'd, whoſe Life is more likely to debauch, than his Doctrine to reform his Hearers.

I might inſiſt on many ſuch Queſtions as theſe; but becauſe Mr. *K.* has not thought fit to give us any reaſon why he takes the Pariſh-Miniſters for the only *lawful Governors*, even to thoſe *Nonconformiſts* that conſent not to their paſtoral relation, I ſhall for their vindication offer this argument, to prove *that the Nonconformiſts live under their lawful ſpiritual Governors or Paſtors, and conſequently make no ſeparation from them.*

I inſtance in the Presbyterians;

Thoſe are the lawful ſpiritual Governors of particular Chriſtian Flocks or Churches, who have all the qualifications requiſite, a valid Ordination, the conſent of thoſe Churches, and who in taking the overſight of them violate no law of God, nor any juſt law of man.

But

But such are the Pastors of the Presbyterian Churches in these Kingdoms; E. *they are the lawful Pastors of those Churches.*

The *minor Prop.* alone needs proof, viz. *That the Pastors of the Presbyt. Churches are such as are here describ'd.*

For their *Qualifications*, and *the consent of the people*; that is matter of fact, concerning which, they may safely appeal to those that know them: Only I would here suggest, that a considerable number of Ministers who prescribe various difficult exercises to a *Candidate* for the trial of his abilities, are as likely to judge of them as one single *Bishop*, who usually commits the examination of them to his Chaplain. For *the validity of their Ordination*, I undertake to make that good in answer to the Questions about *Mission*. The only doubt then remaining is, *Whether these Pastors in taking the oversight of their Flocks, do violate any law of God, or any just law of Man?*

1. *For the laws of God*, I cannot understand any that they should be supposed to violate, but either *that law that enjoyns us to obey Superiors*, or such *as enjoyn the preservation of the Churches peace.*

For the *former*, it falls in with what doubt may arise concerning the laws of men.

For the *latter*, the precepts of God which concern the *Churches peace*, I need only say these two things to clear them from the suspicion of violating them.

1. *That the great duties recommended in the holy Scriptures in order to the preservation of the Churches peace, are a mutual forbearance in things indifferent, and a charitable judgment of each other in lesser differences.*

This is evident from the 14*th Chapt.* of the *Ep.* to the *Rom.* to the 17*th ver.* of the 15*th.* where these duties are at large prest from great variety of *Topicks*, and urg'd on those that had Pastors among them. And to say, this great Rule only oblig'd Christians to these duties till the Clergy had determin'd those *indifferent* things, and by their *imposing* them, cast out all *Dissenters*, is too like the confidence of those *Gentlemen* who own Christ instituted the Communion in both kinds. But tell us his Institution obliges not, now the Church has pleas'd

to

to command it ſhall be otherwiſe. And I do appeal to any impartial judg, whether the *Convocation* or the *Presbyterians* have better obſerv'd this great Rule that concerns the Churches peace; But,

2. *No Law of God enjoyns us to do any thing ſinful for the Churches peace.*

But for the Paſtors of the presbyterian churches to deſert their miniſterial Office when never juſtly forbidden, and when their labours were highly conducive to the Intereſt of Religion and the Salvation of ſouls, were *ſinful.* Methinks thoſe Men that are ſo zealous to exclaim againſt all alienation of church-lands and utenſils as Sacriledg and a very horrid ſin, ſhou'd ſee ſomthing equally hainous if not more ſo, in mens alienating thoſe excellent gifts God has endued them with for the Churches Edification, when never juſtly forbidden the exerciſe of that Miniſtery to which they are devoted. They who are juſtly call'd to that office by *men*, are call'd by *Chriſt*, and are bound to be true and faithful to *him.* And where there is a true neceſſity of their labours, they may anſwer their unjuſt ſilencers, as *Peter* & *John* did; *Acts* 4.19 *Whether it be right in the ſight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judg ye. Timothy*, who was ordain'd by men, yet has that ſolemn charge given him, 2 *Tim.* 4.1,2. that is ſufficient to deter Miniſters from denying their Lord the ſervice they have vow'd him, to pleaſe the unjuſt will of men. I know but one caſe that will excuſe a Miniſter unjuſtly ſilenc'd in forbearing the exerciſe of his Miniſtry, *viz.* when there is no neceſſity of his labours, and the exerciſe of his Miniſtry would by violating publick order do more hurt than good in his preſent circumſtances. But 'tis too evident, this was not the caſe of thoſe 2000 Miniſters ſilenc'd by the *Act of Uniformity.* To that purpoſe, let the conſequences of their *continuing* or *forbearing* their Miniſtry be compar'd. What was the inconvenience of their Preaching more than this, that a point of humane order was violated; ſome needleſs impoſitions (to ſpeak the mildeſt) not comply'd with, (which were deſign'd to promote an impracticable uniformity, but were more likely to prove engines of corrupting and dividing the Church);

Church); and the unjuſt will of the Silencers diſobey'd. What was the advantage of their continuing their Miniſtry? It may be juſtly ſaid to the honour of God, that many thouſands of ignorant ſoul's have been inſtructed in the truths of the Goſpel, and by true converſion or repentance added to the number of Chriſt's myſtical body; the honour of Chriſtianity has been promoted by the purity of their ſocieties through the faithful exerciſe of Church-diſcipline; the ſerious practice of Religion has been more effectually maintain'd in a profane and debauched age; And (what I would chiefly recommend to your conſideration) a vaſt number of ſouls have enjoy'd the ſutable and ſucceſful means of their Edification and Salvation, who either through the irregularity of Pariſh-bounds, or through their own ſcruples about the terms of Pariſh-communion, muſt elſe have wanted them; or through the ill proviſion of Pariſh-Miniſters muſt have ſat under ſuch Paſtors as no man concern'd for his own eternal happineſs ſhould be ſatisfied with where he may have better. For the truth of theſe things, the ſilenced Miniſters may freely appeal to thoſe that know them, and have any ſerious ſenſe of theſe matters. But they will not much regard the judgment of thoſe who think there is no need of any other converſion than from the external profeſſion of a falſe Religion to the profeſſion of a true; And no Regeneration but external Baptiſm, who account all ſufficiently qualified to take a paſtoral charge of ſouls who have got into holy Orders; and think the people bound in complaiſance to the Patron, or the Biſhop to acquieſce in their choice, tho it deprive them of the moſt probable means of their ſalvation, and oblige them to ſit under thoſe as their Paſtors, from whoſe labours little ſucceſs can be rationally expected. But for ſuch as underſtand the real neceſſities and value of ſouls; and know how much the ſucceſs of Miniſters does ordinarily depend on their moral aptitude and abilities for that ſacred Office; and have learnt to prefer the Edification and Salvation of Souls before external order, when inconſiſtent with it: Let them judge, whether the foreſaid Miniſters had not ſinned, had they in thoſe circumſtances deſerted their Miniſtry, and denied their help to

thoſe that needed, and earneſtly crav'd it? *i. e.* Whether it were better that in our large Pariſh-Churches thouſands ſhould live without any publick worſhip of God, or means of ſalvation; Or that all who ſcruple the impoſed conditions of lay-communion ſhou'd live without Paſtors till they can change their judgment; Or that the people in a vaſt number of Pariſhes ſhould live under ſuch as their Paſtors as no ſerious Chriſtian would commit the conduct of his ſoul to, where he may have better; Or that irreligion ſhould prevail through the total neglect of Church-Diſcipline: In a word, whether it were better all the ſouls whom the *Nonconformiſt's Miniſtry* has been the Inſtrument within theſe 25 years to enlighten, ſanctify, and prepare for Heaven, had never enjoy'd their labours, than the external order of Pariſh-bounds ſhould be violated, and the ſuſpected impoſitions (of things own'd by the Impoſers for indifferent) diſobey'd?

Now if it were ſinful for the ſilenc'd Miniſters to deſert their office in ſuch circumſtances, becauſe of an unjuſt prohibition; then no law of God that concerns the Churches peace, does oblige them to it. And that they were unjuſtly prohibited the exerciſe of their office, belongs to the next Head.

2. *The foreſaid Miniſters do in the exerciſe of their Miniſtry violate no juſt law of man.*

The *humane Law* which they violate, enjoyns ſuch conditions of their office as theſe among others.

1. *A Declaration of unfeigned Aſſent and Conſent to all things contained in and preſcribed by the Book entituled the Book of Common-Prayer and Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, &c. and in the form and manner of making, Ordaining, and Conſecrating of Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons.*

2. *The* Oxford *Oath, or ſwearing never to endeavour any alteration of the preſent Church-Government.*

3. *Reordination as to thoſe that had not Prelatical Ordination.*

4. *The Oath of Canonical Obedience, &c.*

Now if theſe conditions of the Miniſtry be ſinful, I would gladly

gladly know whether any humane law be juſt, that forbids the Miniſters of our Lord Jeſus to preach his Goſpel, unleſs they will comply with ſinful terms, or that makes *ſinning* the condition of the exerciſe of their Miniſtry? I hope none will preſume to ſay that which ſets up the authority of *Man* againſt *God's*. I would therefore enquire further, *Ought all to forbear the exerciſe of their Miniſtry who are forbidden by an unjuſt humane Law*? If ſo, why did not *Chriſtian Paſtors* forbear it under *Pagan Emperors*. or the *Orthodox* under the *Arrian*, or *Reformed Paſtors* under *Popiſh* Princes, where the law forbids them? Or will Mr. *R.* ſay, all theſe ought to have forborn and deſerted their office. What! has God left it at the will of men whether he ſhall be publickly worſhipt, whether his Goſpel ſhall be preach'd, whether the Office he has call'd men to ſhall be diſcharg'd, whether ſouls ſhall enjoy the ſutable means of their Salvation, or the number of Miniſters ſhall be proportionable to the real neceſſity of ſouls? Has he given men any power againſt his own intereſt, or to promote the damnation of ſouls by impoſing ſuch terms of the Miniſtry as Chriſt's own Laws forbid his Miniſters to obey? If all ought not to forbear their Miniſtry who are forbidden by an unjuſt Law, *What is there in the caſe of the ſilenc'd Miniſters that ſhould oblige them to it?* I know nothing can be imagin'd but this, That obedience to that Law, tho unjuſt, would in their circumſtances tend more to the good of the Church and ſouls, than all their miniſterial labours. And if any can make this good, I doubt not but they will forbear. For proof of the contrary, ſee *p.* 27, 28. under the former Head.

All the Queſt. therefore will be concerning the conditions of the Miniſtry, that by the foreſaid Law were impos'd upon them.

For the *firſt* mentioned, the *Declaration of Aſſent and Conſent*, &c.

Are there not many thouſands of ſincere and upright Chriſtians in theſe Kingdoms, *who* do really judge *kneeling* at the Sacrament unlawful, becauſe they account it a ſymbolizing with the Church of *Rome* in a ceremony abus'd to Idolatry?

who judge the *Croſs in Baptiſm* unlawful, becauſe 'tis a new *Teſſera* or *ſymbol* of our Chriſtian Profeſſion of humane Inſtitution, to which thoſe very duties and bleſſings of the Goſpel are annext, which our Lord has annext to Baptiſm, eſpecially when the words of the *Canon* are, [*To dedicate them by that badge (the ſign of the Croſs) to the ſervice of Chriſt, whoſe benefits he ſtow'd on them in Baptiſm the name of the Croſs does repreſent*]? Or, who ſcruple the uſe of *Sponſors* in Baptiſm, to undertake that work which is the *Parents* duty, and not *theirs*, unleſs the Parent be incapable; and the more, becauſe the 29th *Canon* of the *Church* ſaith [*No Parent ſhall be urged to be preſent, nor be admitted to anſwer as Godfather for his own child*]? He that knows not, there are many thouſands who judge theſe things unlawful, and yet are perſons as eminent for their piety as thoſe that are otherwiſe minded, is either a ſtranger to theſe Nations, or has very little charity left. Whether theſe perſons be miſtaken in theſe ſcruples or no, I do not now diſpute, nor is it neceſſary to my Argument to ſuppoſe them in the right; But I wou'd hope it will be granted me, that their credible profeſſion of Religion gives them a right to all the ſeals of the Covenant; and that 'tis not lawful to debar *them* from the *Lords Supper*, or their *children* from *Baptiſm* on the account of theſe ſcruples. To ſay otherwiſe, were to make it lawful for the Miniſters of Chriſt to *reject* thoſe whom they have all imaginable reaſon to believe that their Lord *receives*, nay, whom he has commanded them to receive, *Rom.* 14: 1. Whereas to reject ſuch, is a heinous degree of Schiſm, and oppoſite to the great law of Charity and Chriſtian forbearance, which *Paſtors* as well as *people* are concerned in. 'Tis the very ſin *Diotrephes* is charg'd with, 3 *Ep. Joh. v.* 10.

Now if it be unlawful to deprive ſuch of external Church-priviledges as in the judgment of rational Charity have a right to them, then 'tis unlawful to profeſs our Aſſent and Conſent to a Book which obliges us to this Uncharitable and Schiſmatical practice; For the Book obliges us to adminiſter the Sacraments only in the manner there preſcribed, and by the Canons of the Church thoſe Miniſters incur the danger of *Suſpenſion* that do otherwiſe

otherwiſe. So that we cannot be Miniſters without approving th ſe Schiſmatical Conditions of Church Communion, and perhaps excluding the moſt ſober part of a Parish on the account of them. Whereas Chriſtian Love forbids us to *Exclude* ſuch, and much more forbids us to *Aſſent* and *Conſent* to their *Excluſion.*

For the 2d. Condition of the Miniſtry, *That Clauſe in the* Oxford *Oath wherein we muſt ſwear never to endeavour any Alteration of Government in the Church.*

Do's Mr. *K* think there are no Corruptions in the Government of the Church, which if alter'd and reform'd wou'd greatly conduce to the advancement of real Religion? Is the exerciſe of Church-Government by a *Lay-Chancellor* and the manner of their proceſs in the *Spiritual Courts*, no corruption that needs amendment? What when ſo ſolemn a thing as the Cenſures of the Church is manag'd more like a deſign to correct mens purſes then either the Errors of their Judgment or diſorders of their Practice, and as Dr. *Burnet* in the life of Biſhop *Bedel* complains, *That Excommunication had loſt all its force as a Spiritual Cenſure and was dreaded only on the account of the effects it produc't in Law.* And theſe matters are not ſince chang'd for the better. Is that Diſcipline by which every particular Church ſhou'd be as much as poſſible preſerv'd from the infection and ſcandal of notoriouſly wicked members, poſſible to be exerciſed by a *Biſhop* or his *Lay-Chancellor* for a whole *Diocеſs* containing 3 or 4 hundred or perhaps as many more particular Churches? For Inſtance, Is the *Biſhop* of *Lincoln* whoſe Dioceſs contains in it 1000 or 1100 Pariſh-Churches capable to call all the ſcandalous ſinners within that vaſt Precinct to Repentance, to examine the crimes alledg'd againſt them, uſe all the admonitions and reproofs that tend to reclaim them and after due evidence of their impenitency caſt them out of Church Communion? How many thouſands muſt he have at once in his Court if he exerciſed Church Diſcipline as ſtrictly as the H. Scriptures enjoyn or as the *Common-Prayer-Book* owns it was practiſed in the primitive Church. *See Preface to the Commination uſed in Lent.* And does there need any plainer

Argu-

Argument of the impoſſibility of it, then that this Diſcipline was never actually exerciſed by the Biſhops to any purpoſe, nor one ſcandalous ſinner of a thouſand in a Dioceſs ever call'd to Repentance for his notorious crimes or cenſured for his continuing in them (unleſs it were ſome ſcrupulous Nonconformiſt.) And does Mr. *K.* think theſe things need no alteration? If he doth ſo, I would gladly know, What Church-Government or Diſcipline ſignifies? To what purpoſe then is all this ſtir about an *Empty Name*, when there is no uſe to be made of the *Thing* to the great purpoſes it's intended for? when 'tis not exerciſed to preſerve the honour of Religion by a credible profeſſion of it in particular Churches, and to ſecure thoſe Churches from the pernicious influence of ſuch whom their Hæreſies or their ſcandalous crimes render unfit for Chriſtian Society?

If theſe things be groſs abuſes, If the preſent Church-Government render Diſcipline impracticable, and deprive Pariſh-Miniſters of an eſſential part of their Office, Is it lawful to ſwear We will never endeavour an alteration of this, and that without any limitation ſignified, as [*in an irregular manner or beyond our particular Sphære?*] Is it lawful for thoſe who know theſe to be corruptions which have greatly depraved the Church and diſhonoured Chriſtianity to ſwear they will never *endeavour to amend* them? They might as well bind themſelves by oath never to *Repent* nor *Promote the Repentance of others.*

If any ſay the meaning of the Oath is only, that they will never endeavour this [*by any ſinful means, or beyond their private ſphere*]; Why could not theſe neceſſary words be put in? And that this dangerous ſenſe was never intended by the *Convocation*, is evident from the *7th Canon*, where they thus ſpeak; [*Whoſoever ſhall hereafter affirm that the Government of the Church of* England *under his Majeſty, by Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Deans, Archdeacons, and the reſt that bear Office in the ſame is Antichriſtian, or repugnant to the word of God, let him be excommunicate* ipſo facto, *and ſo continue till he repent, and revoke ſuch his wicked error*]. They that thus ſuppos'd nothing in their Government *repugnant to the word of God*, did without doubt

doubt intend to bind the interiour Clergy from *all attempts to alter it*; and ſo contriv'd this Oath, that an Allegiance might be in theſe Nations ſworn to the Biſhops as well as the King.

For the 3d. viz. Reordination. The Divines of the Church of *England* generally own it *unlawful*; and conſequently, the impoſition of it ſuppoſes Ordination by Presbyters a *Nullity*. For ſuch therefore as were ſo ordain'd to conſent to *Reordination*, is to own the *Nullity* of their former Adminiſtrations, and caſt the baſeſt ſlurr on a great part of the *Reformed Miniſtry*. And this reminds me of a paſſage in the Preface to the Book of *Ordination*, which acquaints us with the judgment of thoſe that compos'd it, *Viz.* [And to this intent, that theſe Orders be reverently eſteem'd, No man ſhall be accounted or taken for a lawful Prieſt in the *Ch. of Engl.* or be ſuffer'd to execute the *Function*, except he be called according to this form, or hath had formerly *Epiſcopal Ordination*.] And this we muſt profeſs our Aſſent and Conſent to; which he that can do, (and makes conſcience of declaring nothing but what he really believes) has either a large ſtock of ignorance, or very little charity; (as will appear by what is ſaid on the Head about *Miſſion*). The Authors of that Preface cou'd not but foreſee, that ſuch Declarations would effectually choke a great part of the Miniſters in *England* and *Ireland*, and 'tis hard to imagine what other deſign they could have in requiring their Aſſent and Conſent to ſuch paſſages as theſe.

For the Oath of Canonical obedience viz. *That the Prieſts or Deacons will reverently obey their Ordinary and other chief Miniſters to whom is committed the Charge and Government over them.*

I ſuppoſe 'Tis meant of obedience to their Ordinary in what he preſcribes agreably to the Canons which are the known Rule he governs by. And ſo we ſhould be obliged to read the ſentence of excommunication againſt all that the *Biſhop* or his *Chancellor* may according to thoſe Canons excommunicate, now he may excommunicate all *Nonconformiſts*.

And we that know them to be men of holy and blameleſs lives

lives, muſt ſwear to obey the Biſhop, by publiſhing his *ſchiſmatical* ſentence.

I might have added ſeveral things more on this Head, were it neceſſary.

I know ſome have told the world freely, that in their Declaration of Aſſent, &c. they intend no more than to receive thoſe Books as an *Inſtrument of peace*; ſo that they will not preach againſt any thing contain'd in them, as ſome ſubſcribe even the Articles themſelves: To which I need only anſwer;

1. It us'd to be acknowledg'd by *Prot. Caſuiſts*, (as 'tis largely aſſerted by Biſhop *Sanderſon de Juram.*) That to ſtretch the words of Laws, Oaths, and Promiſes to meanings different from their common uſe, is ſinful, and a practice fitter for thoſe that own the Doctrine of *Equivocations*, &c, than ſincere Chriſtians, or good ſubjects. Now if to *Aſſent and Conſent to all things contain'd in, and preſcrib'd by a Book*, be not an *Aſſent* to them as *true*, and *Conſent* to them as *good or lawful*; 'tis impoſſible to underſtand the ſenſe of thoſe two words. And what might not a man in this *lax* ſenſe declare his *Aſſent* and *Conſent* to, tho never ſo much againſt his judgment, provided he did not think himſelf oblig'd to ſpeak publickly againſt it. That the *Parliament* never intended that *lax* ſenſe, appears hence; That when the *Houſe of Lords* added a *Proviſo*, that the Declaration in the Act of Uniformity ſhould be underſtood but as obliging men to the *uſe* of the Book, the *Houſe of Commons* refus'd it at a Conference about it, and gave ſuch reaſons againſt that ſenſe and *Proviſo* to the *Lords*; upon which they acquieſc'd, and caſt it out.

2. Whatever meaning be put on the forementioned declarations and oaths, None can exerciſe his Miniſtry in the *Church* of *England* without denying the priviledges of Chriſtianity to thoſe that have a right to them and without quiting an eſſential part of his office as Paſtor of a particular Church, or incurring the danger of ſuſpenſion for doing otherwiſe. And the Miniſters of Chriſt muſt not put themſelves under ſuch a neceſſity of acting uncharitably and ſchiſmatically towards his true Members, nor thus wilfully maim and deprave their Paſtoral office.

I appeal

I appeal then to the Judgment of all, Whether if theſe conditions of the Miniſtry be ſinful, That Law be juſt that ſhall enjoyn them, and make mens forſwearing themſelves neceſſary to the preaching of the Goſpel?

I am very ſorry Mr. *K.* and ſome of his Coat ſhould ſo often neceſſitate their Brethren to harp on this ungrateful ſtring. They pay too great a deference to the Laws of the Land to caſt any needleſs Reflections on them. But men ought not to bear ſilently the charge of *Schiſm* and *Church Rebellion*, who are no way guilty of it. Eſpecially when their ſilence and neglect to vindicate themſelves may tempt others who are not acquainted with their caſe, to cenſure and hate them wrongfully, as cloth'd with theſe odious characters. I hope the precedent diſcourſe has evidenc'd the charge to be undeſerved and falſe. And therefore whatever expreſſions ſeem to grate on the Laws, muſt be imputed to the unhappy neceſſity put upon them to give a true repreſentation of their caſe, by the virulent accuſations of their brethren, from whom one wou'd think they might rather expect ſome pitty. I doubt not but the *moderate* and *charitable* part of the *Conforming Clergy* have other apprehenſions of their *brethren*, and are aſham'd of theſe paſſages in M. *K*'s *Anſwer*. But for thoſe that approve the ſilencing Laws, arraign their Brethren as *Church-Rebels* for not obeying them, and condemn thoſe ſocieties that need and embrace their help meerly on that ſcore, as no parts of the Catholick Church, even when they exclude not the *Popiſh Churches*, It will appear, I think, from this Paper, that their *Arguments* are not ſo ſtrong as their *Paſſion*, and a *little more charity* wou'd advance the reputation of their *Intellectuals* as well as *Morals*. Such men may long exclaim againſt *our diviſions*, but their own principles and temper *are the moſt inſuperable obſtacle* to the healing of them.

Having conſidered the *Queſtions* in the *Preface*, I come to examine the firſt *ſett* of thoſe in the *Pamphlet* it ſelf, which concern the *Miſſion* of the firſt *Reformers*, and they are by Mr. *K.* reduc'd to theſe five.

1. *What Prieſthood or Holy Orders had the firſt Reformers but what they receiv'd from the hands of Roman-Catholick Biſhops?*

2. *Who authoriz'd the firſt Reformers to preach their Proteſtant Doctrine, and adminiſter their Proteſtant Sacraments?*

3. *Whether* Cranmer *and his Aſſociates could condemn the Church of* Rome *by pretence of the Miſſion they received from her Biſhops?*

4. *Whether a Presbyterian Miniſter having received Orders from a Proteſtant Biſhop, can by virtue of ſuch Orders pronounce the Church of* England *a corrupt Church?*

5. *Whether an Act of Parliament in* France, Spain, *or* Germany, *be not as good an Authority for Popery there, as in* England *for Proteſtancy?*

Theſe are *Queſtions* one would think too ridiculous to be ſeriouſly propos'd. But I am heartily ſorry Mr. *K.* can find no better Anſwer to them than what he has given, which in ſeveral paſſages runs too much on the ſame wretched miſtak s that led D. *Manby* to offer them with ſo much confidence.

And therefore I need ſay little more to expoſe them, than firſt *ſtate* the Controverſy about *Miſſion*, and then *apply* the true Notion of it to theſe Queſtions.

There is a twofold *Miſſion*, *Immediate* or *Mediate:*

1. *Immediate*, Which thoſe had whom God ſent to deliver ſome extraordinary meſſage, or ſome new revelation of his will to men. Such a *Miſſion* had the extraordinary *Prophets* under the old Teſtament, the *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts* under the new. And theſe brought ſome *Credentials* of their *Miſſion* to convince men of the truth of it. That immediate *Miſſion* is now ceas'd; the revelation of the Divine Will being compleated in the holy Scriptures, and directions given for the continuance of a Miniſtry in the Church. There is therefore,

2. A *Mediate Miſſion*, or *Call* to the Paſtoral Office. (For we are not here concern'd with the office of Deacons), I mean that office of Biſhops, or Elders, or Miniſters (for they are but ſeveral names to import the ſame thing) ſo often deſcrib'd in the holy Scriptures. The office contains in it many great and laborious

laborious works, *To teach the Flock committed to their charge, be their Guides in publick Worſhip, and rule them by Evangelical Diſcipline.* A *Call* to this Office gives the perſon call'd *authority* to do thoſe works, and lays on him a perſonal *obligation* to do them. 'Tis from *Chriſt* alone that power is deriv'd by which men are authoriz'd and oblig'd. 'Tis his will expreſt in the *Goſpel-Charter* conſtitutes men his Miniſters. And all that's further requiſite, is, to know how he ſignifies his will concerning this or that particular perſon, being one of his Miniſters.

To that purpoſe we muſt conſider *what Chriſt has done already in the Goſpel-Charter, and what he has left for men to do.*

Chriſt has already determined in the Goſpel that there ſhall be a Miniſtry in his Church to the end of the World: He has deſcrib'd their Office, and all the particular works of it; as what Doctrine they ſhall preach, what Worſhip they ſhall celebrate, how they ſhall rule the Church they overſee, and what Diſcipline they ſhall adminiſter in it: He has left them ſufficient rules in all matters of univerſal conſtant neceſſity for performing theſe works: He has deſcrib'd the duties which Chriſtian Flocks owe to ſuch Paſtors: He has aſſign'd the qualifications of ſuch Paſtors; He has made it the duty of people that need the labours of ſuch qualified perſons to ſeek their help, and of Miniſters to call them out, approve, and inveſt them in that Office, and of the Civil Magiſtrate to protect the Worthy.

It belongs not therefore to any men to appoint any new office in the Church of Chriſt, or maim that Office he has inſtituted, or impoſe ſinful conditions in order to its exerciſe, or impoſe any other duties on the people than he has done; much leſs does it belong to them to determine whether the Goſpel ſhall be preach'd, or the neceſſities of ſouls who want ſuch Paſtors ſupply'd.

All therefore that the Goſpel has left to the Ordainers, is the *Deſignation* of the perſon to whom Chriſt's *Charter* ſhall convey the power, the *approbation* of his qualifications, and the *In-*

veſtiture of him, or ſolemnizing his admittance. The *Ordainers* therefore do not give the power to others as from themſelves, nor does it paſs through their hands, nor can they diminiſh it, as *ex gr.* ſhould the Ordainers ſay, [Receive thou power to preach and adminiſter the Sacraments, but not to rule the Flock:] This reſtraint or diminution is *null*, as being contrary to the *Charter of Chriſt*. They are but *Inſtruments* of *Inauguration*, as a *Recorder* that inveſts a *Mayor* in that office which the *King's Charter* gives him. And the great deſign of the *Interpoſition* of Paſtors in this matter is, to ſecure to the Church a ſucceſſion of able and blameleſs Paſtors, of which they are ſuppoſed moſt fit to judge. *Ordination* by *Paſtors* is God's ordinary regular way of admittance to prevent the Churches being deprav'd and injur'd by the *intruſion* of unqualified perſons. And therefore it ſhould not be neglected wherever it may be had. Only it muſt be added, that *the law of Chriſt* which determines, that the Goſpel ſhall be preach'd by perſons ſo qualified, is founded *on the neceſſity of ſouls*, and the *great law of Charity*; and therefore is of conſtant and indiſpenſible neceſſity in the Church. But the command of their being *Ordain'd by Paſtors*, is but ſubſervient to the former, and relates only to the ordinary *regular execution* of it; and does not oblige where there is a *phyſical* or *moral impoſſibility* of obſerving it, and yet a *neceſſity of the Miniſtry*. For *Ordination by Paſtors* is not of *abſolute neceſſity* to the *being* of the *Miniſtry*; There have been and may be extraordinary caſes wherein a man may be obliged to be a Miniſter without it: To inſtance in two caſes;

What if many *Chriſtians* ſhould be caſt on the ſhore of ſome *Pagan Nation*, where they are forc'd to ſtay a conſiderable time, and one among them be more *eminently qualified than the reſt, to be their Miniſter*; the reſt entreat his help; and will any ſay, that the *Providence of God*, which has given him ſuch abilities, does not ſufficiently *authoriſe* him to exerciſe them in this caſe of neceſsity? When the *work of the Miniſtry* is of ſo much greater *importance and neceſſity* than that poſitive precept about the ordering of it. Nay, to propoſe a Caſe far more conſiderable:

What

What if all the present Pastors in a Nation should *corrupt* the *Christian Doctrine* and *Worship*, and *impose* those corruptions on the people as terms of *Church-Communion*? What if they refuse to *ordain any that will not joyn with them herein*? The people dare not comply with those terms, and because they would not live without the advantages of the publick Ministry and Worship, they invite such to take the Pastoral care of their Souls as are duly qualified; that such qualified persons should not accept *Ordination* on such wicked terms, is past doubt; But what if they live so remote from any other *Christian Kingdom* that they cannot have *Ministerial Ordination* elsewhere. Will any say, that in this case, those qualified persons for want of this *Ordination* ought not to take on them the *Pastoral charge* of those people, which God has given them such abilities for, and such a *Call* by his providence to? To say this, were to set up the Rule about the regular *ordering* the Ministry above the *ends* of the Ministry it self, and oppose the *circumstances* of the Duty to the *substance* of it. Whereas *positive* precepts must always yield to *moral*, and matters of meer *order* to the *end* of the Duty ordered; and the *former* must never be pleaded against the *latter*. *Ordination* by Pastors is not therefore there necessary where it cannot be had without sin; and yet without a Ministry; the interest of the Gospel, and the salvation of Souls, are like to suffer the most visible prejudice and detriment. For these are matters infinitely more precious and valuable than any Rules of external order, and the very end those Rules aim at, and are subservient to. And if this be not granted, it must be left to the pleasure of such corrupt Pastors, whether the people who cannot joyn in communion with them, shall enjoy the means of their salvation, or be obliged to live like Atheists without any publick worship of God. And he that asserts this, may next assert, that God has left it to their pleasure, whether the people shall be saved or damn'd; and that 'tis better they should be *canonically* damn'd than *uncanonically* sav'd. I propose these Cases to shew the vanity and falsehood of that Notion some make such a noise about, *viz: The necessity of an uninterrupted succession of Ordination.* And

if

if that principle be false: much more is theirs who assert the necessity of Successive prelatical ordination.

But tho in such *extraordinary* Cases, The extraordinary call of God's providence is sufficient to authorize a man to the sacred office, and supplies the defect of Ministerial Ordination; Yet the command of God which enjoyns such Ordination does oblige where it may be had; and the neglect of it wou'd bring great confusion and disorder into the Church, and expose it to the danger of being corrupted and divided by *unqualified Intruders.*

The only thing that remains to be consider'd under this Head is, *Who are entrusted with the power of ordination*, Or whom has Christ appointed to approve and invest others in the Ministerial office?

Answ. Those are entrusted with this power and appointed to this work, Who are themselves such *Bishops* or *Elders* or *Pastors* as the holy Scriptures describe, He that denies this, is oblig'd to acquaint us what other Officers the Apostles left in the Church, to whom this sole power of ordination was entrusted then, or what other officers claimed and exercised it in the primitive Church, Which none that I know of ever pretended to do.

But now those whom the holy Scriptures call Bishops or Elders, were the stated pastors of particular Congregations.

That the same persons are in Scripture call'd Bishops and Elders is too palpable to be denied (However the Authors of the Preface to the Book of Ordination are pleased to say the contrary, viz. *That 'tis evident to all men diligently reading the holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles time there have been these orders in Christs Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons*, (as several offices) and even this palpable mistake among the rest we are required to declare our assent to.) Those who are 20 *Acts.* 17. called the *Elders* of the Church of *Ephesus*, are commanded, *v.* 28. to take heed to all the Flock, over whom the holy Ghost had made them *overseers* or *Bishops*. The description of a *Bishop* 1 *Tim:* 3 *ch.* and of an *Elder* 1 *Tit.* are the same; And *Titus* when directed to ordain *Elders* must

see

ſee that they be blameleſs, for a *Biſhop* muſt be blameleſs as the Steward of God, *v.* 6, 7.

That theſe *Biſhops* or *Elders* were Paſtors of ſingle congregations is evident from the *Duties* enjoyned them towards thoſe under their care, and from the *Duties* which the Flocks are required to pay them.

They are to *labour among the people and admoniſh them*, And the people were to *know and eſteem them highly in love for their works ſake* 1 Theſs. 5, 12, 13. They were to *rule their Flock, ſpeak the word of God to them*, and to *watch over their Souls as thoſe that muſt give an account*; 13 Hebr. 7, 17, 24. They were to *take heed to all the Flock over whom the Holy Ghoſt had made them overſeers.* 20 Acts, 28. Wherein the Apoſtle propoſes his own practice, (while he ſtay'd among them as their temporary paſtor) for their imitation viz *That he taught them publickly, and from houſe to houſe*, and ceaſed not to *warn every one with tears day and night* 20 Acts, 20, 31. v. They were to bee *enſamples to the Flock* who were to *follow their Faith conſidering the end of their Converſation*, 1 *Pet.* 5, *v.* 3, compar'd with *Heb*: 13. 7, They were to *viſit the ſick and pray for them James*, 5, 14. ſee Dr. *Hammond*'s Annotations on theſe places applying them to Biſhops.

Now let us conſider whether theſe mutual duties, betwixt Paſtor and Flock were to be performed betwixt the *Paſtor* or *Paſtors* of a *ſingle* congregation, and the congregation committed to their care or betwixt a *Dioceſan* Biſhop and ſo vaſt a Flock as his *Dioceſs*.

That one or more Paſtors of a ſingle congregation aſſociated for perſonall communion are capable of performing theſe duties to their Flock, and their Flock to them is paſt all doubt.

But can theſe mutual Duties be perform'd betwixt a *Dioceſan* Biſhop and his *Dioceſs*? Is he capable of *labouring amongſt them in word*, and being *eſteem'd of them highly for his Works ſake*, when very few, comparatively of his Dioceſs, ever *ſaw* him, or *heard* him preach? Can he *watch over the ſouls* of all in his Dioceſs as his Flock, and warn them of their evil courſes, when he knows not one of them in many ſcore thouſands?

Can

Can the Dioceſs *follow the Faith of* ſuch Biſhops, and *conſider the end of their converſation*, and propoſe them as their patterns, when not one in many thouſands know any more of the life of their Biſhop, than if he lived at the other end of the World? Are ſuch Biſhops obliged to viſit the ſick of their Dioceſs? Can they rule them by the exerciſe of Church-diſcipline againſt the notoriouſly ſcandalous, when perhaps there are forty or fifty thouſand ſuch in their *Dioceſs*? Can they uſe all the due proceſs of ſerious reproofs and perſwaſions that are requiſite to be uſed for reclaiming ſuch ſinners, when there is ſo vaſt a number of them, and thoſe ſo remote in their habitations, and the Biſhops wholly ſtrangers to the moſt of them? Theſe are ſo palpable impoſſibilities, as to an unbyaſt conſiderer, are inſtead of a thouſand Arguments; that the Biſhops or Elders which theſe Texts ſpeak of were not *Diœceſan Biſhops, i. e.* they were not the Overſeers or Rulers of many ſcore or hundreds of Churches, as their Flocks to whom they were to perform all theſe Paſtoral works, and the Flocks to pay them the forementioned Duties; But the Paſtors of ſuch a number of people as they could thus perſonally *overſee, teach, rule, watch over, viſit, &c.* and ſuch a number as could pay them that *love, ſubmiſſion, imitation, &c.* preſcrib'd in the forequoted Texts. Eſpecially when 'tis ſo expreſly aſſerted. *Acts* 14. *v.* 23. *That ſuch Elders were ordained in every Church*, which *Titus is alſo appointed to do in every City*, 1 *Tit.* 5. And 'tis well known every *Town* equal to our uſual *Market-Towns* in *England* was then called πόλις, or *City*; and but a few comparatively of the inhabitants at firſt converted to Chriſtianity.

I grant, that ſoon after the Apoſtles time, the name of Biſhop and Presbyter, or Elder, begun to be diſtinguiſht, and that of Biſhop apply'd to a ſtated Præſes or Moderator of a Preſbytery or certain number of Elders. But 'tis as evident, That the Biſhop and his Presbyters in the Primitive Church were but the Rulers of one *Single* Congregation capable of perſonal communion, not of many *Score* or *hundred* Churches. How plain to this purpoſe is that known paſſage of *Ignatius* (whoſe Authority the Defenders of Prelacies have ſo vainly boaſted of.)

who

who in his Epiſtle to the *Philadelphians* gives this certain mark of every Churches *individuation, viz. There is to every Church one Altar and one Biſhop together with the Presbytery (or Elderſhip) and the Deacons my fellow ſervants.* The ſame Author in his Epiſtle to *Polycarp* adviſes that good *Biſhop to have frequent Church-Aſſemblies, and to enquire after all by name, and not to deſpiſe ſervants and maids:* So in his Epiſtle to the *Smyrnenſes, Follow all of you the Biſhop as Jeſus Chriſt does the Father, and the Presbytery as the Apoſtles, and reverence the Deacons as the appointment of God. Let none without the Biſhop tranſact the affairs of the Church. Let that be accounted a valid communion which is in his preſence, or by his permiſſion; for where the Biſhop is, there let the multitude be. 'Tis not lawful, without the Biſhop, to Baptize, or make a Love-Feaſt.* Ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, &c. πάντες, &c.

Nothing can more fully evidence that the Church of *Smyrna* had their *Biſhop, Presbyters,* and *Deacons*; and 'twere ridiculous to apply theſe paſſages to a *modern Biſhop and his Dioceſs.*

Juſtin Martyr's known account of Church-Aſſemblies evinces the truth of this which the learned Mr. *Joſ. Mede* in his *Diſcourſe of Churches* quotes, p. 48, 49, 50. and from thence acknowledges, *They had then but one Altar, (or place of Communion) to a Church, taken for the company or corporation of the faithful, as united under one Biſhop.*

Tertullian's account of particular Church-aſſemblies aſſures us, *that Church-diſcipline was exercis'd in them,* and that by the *probati ſeniores,* or *approved Elders* (among whom we own the *Preſes* was called Biſhop). Even in *Cyprian*'s time, his famous Church of *Carthage* was not ſo great, but that he frequently profeſſes he would do nothing in Church-affairs without the conſent of his *Presbyters,* and all *the people,* eſpecially in the *cenſuring of Offendors.* As in his *Ep.* 3. 6, 10 11, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, &c. *Edit. Goul.* And *Ep.* 68. as he there declares the people have the *chiefeſt power of chooſing worthy Prieſts, and refuſing the unworthy*; ſo when he relates the manner of the *Ordination* of a Biſhop, he tells us, *All the next Biſhops of the ſame Province do come together to that* *Apol. cap.*

people over whom the Biſhop is ſet, and the Biſhop is appointed, the people being preſent who fulleſt know the life of every one, and have thoroughly ſeen the Act of every one's converſation. Which alſo we ſaw done with you in the Ordination of Sabinus *our Colleague, that the office of a Biſhop was given him, and hands impoſed on him in the place of* Baſilides *by the ſuffrage of the whole Fraternity, and by the judgment of the Biſhops that had met together, &c.*

We may eaſily gather what the Biſhops Church was when all the people muſt be preſent, and judge of his life, and are ſuppoſed to be thoroughly acquainted with it. A Dioceſs of the modern extent would be hard put to it to meet together for this purpoſe, and paſs their judgment concerning the life of their Biſhop.

The *Conſtitutions and Canons* called *Apoſtolical*, aſſign ſuch duties to the Biſhop, as plainly imply his relation to a Congregation capable of perſonal Communion, as his Charge or Flock.

And (to give a brief ſummary of thoſe proofs which it would require a large volume to inſiſt fully on) if we conſider impartially all the duties which the moſt ancient Chriſtian Writers deſcribe, as belonging to the office of a *Biſhop*, *viz.* [To be the ordinary publick Teacher of his Flock, (*a*) and Baptizer of thoſe that were received into his Church. (*b*) To confirm the Baptized, to reconcile and abſolve all penitents, to adminiſter the Lords Supper. (*c*) To receive all oblations, *&c.* and diſtribute them, To take care of the poor and ſick and ſtrangers as their Overſeer and Curator (*d*) To try all cauſes about ſcandal in his Church with his *Preſbyters* in the preſence of his *Flock* (*e*) To Ordain other Biſhops and Elders, To keep Synods among his neighbour Biſhops, To grant communicatory Letters (*f*) *&c.*] And to how great a flock one man is capable to perform them: If we conſider further that the Biſhop and his Presbyters liv'd uſually in the ſame *Houſe* and in *Common*, at leaſt near the *Church*, and that in the diſtribution of their maintenance one half of it was deſtin'd to repair the Fabrick or Temple, and maintain the poor; the other half to the Biſhop and his Clergy,

or

or Presbyters (*g*); That it was the common cuſtom for the *Presbyters* to ſit in the ſame Seat with the *Biſhop* (in a ſemicircle) and the *Deacons* below them (*h*); That the *Deacons* are always mentioned as Officers in the ſame Church with the *Biſhop* (*i*). That the *Love-feaſts* were not to be kept without the Biſhops permiſſion, and he was to have his ſhare ſent him, if abſent (*k*). That the way of ſtrangers communicating was by *communicatory Letters* or Certificates which were to be ſhewed to the Biſhop of the Church where they deſir'd to communicate (*l*). That a Schiſm was deſcrib'd by ſetting up *Altar* againſt *Altar*, every communicating Church having its *Altar* (or *Table* for celebrating the Lords-Supper) and Biſhop (*m*).

(a) *Conſtit: Apoſt. c.* 26. *Juſt: Mart. Apol:* 2: (b) *Tertull. de Cor: Mil. c.* 3. (c) *Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn: p:* 4. *Juſt: Mart: Apol:* 2. (d) *Juſt. Mart. ibid Conſtit: Apoſt. c.* 27. *Apoſt. Can.* 5: (e) See *Cypr Ep. paſſim, Tertull. Apol. c.* 39. and many more in *Blondel de Jure plebis, &c.* (f) See *Albaſp. Obſerv. p.* 254, 255. (g) See *Tolet de ſacerd. lib.* 5: *cap.* 4. *n.* 15. and *Pad. Paul Sarpi's* Tract of Church-benefices tranſlated by Dr. *Denton.* (h) *Conſtit. Apoſt. c.* 57. *Counc. Carth.* 4: *Can:* 35 (*i*) 1 *Phil. v.* 1. *Clem. Rom: Ep: ad Cor: p:* 54, 55: *Pius in Ep: Juſto Epiſc. Biblioth: Patr: Tom:* 3: *p:* 15: *Conſtit: Apoſt: c:* 30 & 44. (k) *Ignat: Ep. ad Smyrn.* forequoted. *Conſtit. Apoſt. c.* 28: (*l*) *Albaſp. Obſerv. p.* 254, 255. (*m*) *Ignat. Ep: ad Philad.* forecited. *Cypr. Ep:* 40, 72, 73. The ancient deſcription of a Church is well known, *Plebs Epiſcopo coadunata*: See Dr. *Still. Iren. p.* 416.

That the Biſhop was choſen by the *Suffrages* or *Votes* of the people he took the charge of, (*n*) and (as was ſaid before) adminiſtred Church-cenſures in the preſence of his Flock, whoſe judgment he conſulted (*o*:) That Presbyters did but ſeldom preach publickly in the two or three firſt Ages, except in *Alexandria* or ſome few Churches that had Presbyters of more than ordinary Learning and Abilities; *Chryſoſtom's* preaching at *Antioch*, and *Auſtin's* at *Hippo*, while Presbyters are noted as unuſual; That every City had its Biſhop, is granted by all; (and Dr. *Hammond* and *Grotius* own many had two, nay, ſome

had more, as might appear by many instances, were it needful.) And every Town of any bigness was then called πόλις, or City, and the number of Christians did not of a long time even in the larger Cities exceed that of our larger Parishes. Nor were Bishops confin'd to Cities or Towns; for the Countrey Villages (where there were any tolerable number of Christians to make a Church or Congregation) had long their Bishops also, who were not put down till Ambition had begun to deprave the Church, and for a reason agreeable to the humour of those that did it, *ne vilescat nomen Episcopi* (*p*): If we consider the nearness of Episcopal *See's* of which we read many that were much nearer one another than our Market-Towns, perhaps one, two, or a few more miles distant (*q*): If we observe all the small inconsiderable places that were the *See's* of many famous ancient Bishops, not half so big as our lesser sort of Parishes (*r*): If we consider the vast number of Bishops mentioned within a narrow compass of ground.

(*n*) See *Cypr. Ep.* 68 forecited, and many more testimonies in *Baxter's* Church-History, & Answer to *Stillingfl.* from *p.* 128 to 133. and in *Blondel de Jure plebis, &c.* (*o*) See *Blondel, ibid.* (*p*) *Concil. Laod. Can.* 57. (*q*) To give a few instances; In *Palestine*, *Diospolis or Lydda* was but six miles from *Joppa*, *Joppa* four miles from *Jamnia*; *Rhinocoruca* four miles from *Anthedon*, and *Anthedon* not three miles from *Gaza*, *and Gaza* twenty furlongs from *Constantia* (anciently called *Majuma*). So in *Egypt*, *Nicopolis* was twenty furlongs from *Alexandria*, and *Taposiris*, *Canopus*, *Heraclia* and *Naucratis* not much farther from one another; and yet all these Episcopal *See's* (*r*). Mr. *Thorndike Right of Churches reviewed*, tells us, *p.* 53. that in *Africa* Bishops were so plentiful, that every good Village must needs be the Seat of an Episcopal Church; and the *African* Church, as Dr. *Stillingfleet* tells us, *Iren. p.* 373. longest retain'd the primitive simplicity and humility.

Binnius tells us of *Sylvester* calling together 284 Bishops, of which 139 were out of *Rome*, or not far from it. A Council of *Donatists* at *Carthage* had 270 Bishops (as *Austin* tells us, *Ep.* 68) about the year 308, and yet they were the smaller number, and com-

complain'd of Perſecution. *Victor. Vtic: in Perſec: Vand.* acquaints us that in that part of *Africa* 660 Biſhops fled beſides the great number murdered and impriſoned and many tolerated, The *6th* Provincial Council of *Carthage* had 217 Biſhops. And to give an inſtance of later date which we are more capable to judge of, even *Patrick* is ſaid to have founded here in *Ireland* 365 Churches, ordain'd ſo many Biſhops beſides 3000 *Preſbyters*. *Uſher de Eccleſ: Brit. Primord.* p. 950. If we add hereto the late date of Pariſhes as diſtinguiſhed from the Biſhops Church, (The Government of the Cathedrall by the Biſhop with the Dean, and chapters being a Relict of the ancient Epiſcopal Government) From theſe evidencies (and many more might be added) duly weigh'd, Wee may eaſily judge what the ancient Churches and Biſhops were. A primitive Biſhop had no more then one Church, or aſſembly capable of perſonal Communion under his Charge, which he rul'd with the joynt concurrence of his *Presbyters* or *Elders*. The firſt that ſet up more Aſſemblies under one Biſhop were *Rome* and *Alexandria*, and no other Church can be prov'd to have done ſo for near 300 years nor many Churches for 4 or 5 hundred. And even thoſe Aſſemblies did but long make up one communicating Church, and were but to the Biſhops Church as Chappels of eaſe are to our larger Pariſh Churches. But for Dioceſan Churches and Biſhops, 'tis evident from theſe few remarks, That they are entire ſtrangers to the primitive Church in its firſt and pureſt Ages. 'Twas only Ambition (ſtriving to modell the Eccleſiaſtical Government by the Civil) that firſt gave riſe to them, and from the ſame ambition in the Empire, ſprung up *Metropolitans*, *Patriarks* and *Popes*, (The laſt of theſe long claiming only a Primacy of order among the reſt of the Biſhops in the Empire, for which *Conſtantinople* long vy'd with them, 'tis but of late they have emprov'd their pretenſions into a claim of Supremacy over the Catholick Church as the *Vicars* of Chriſt) And 'tis too obſervable in Church Hiſtory that as the Seats of Biſhops ſwell'd and their power encreaſt by engroſſing to themſelves that work which a ſcore or hundred Biſhops cou'd hardly diſcharge, ſo all true Diſcipline was gradually [illegible]

us'd and lost, and the Church miserably deprav'd by the corruption of it, as well as divided by the Contentions of aspiring Bishops about their primacy and usurped power.

If you desire further satisfaction on this head, I referr you to Mr. *Baxters Treatise of Episcopacy* who in the 2*d*. part 5, 6, 7: *ch*. has given as Satisfactory an account of the ancient Episcopacy as can be expected of any matter of fact at that distance The few slender exceptions produc't by Dr. *Stillingfl*. in his *Unreason*. of *Sepers* (which yet do not reach the two first Centuries) are so clearly invalidated and expos'd by Mr. *Baxters Answer to* Dr: *St*. *p*. 100, 101, &c. and by *Mr. Clerkson* in his, *No evidence of Diocesan Churches in Antiq: &c*: that I shall take it for granted that, *Diocesan Bishops* and *Churches* are *Strangers* to *Antiquity*, and shall look on that cause as desperate and lost, unless some of its *Patrons* cou'd disprove that full stream of evidence he has brought against it from the most ancient Christian writers in the forementiõn'd Treatise. There are few considerable defenders of Prelacy, whose writings he has not animadverted on.

And tis strange to observe, how farr the most of them mistake the true state of the controversie. Some go about to prove a sort of general superintendents Arch-Bishops, or Metropolitans who had some inspection over the Bishops of particular Churches within their Province, and presided in their Synods, but did not put down the Government and exercise of Church-Discipline in those particular Churches, as if this were a proof of those *Diocesan Bishops* that do cast out all Government and exercise of Discipline by the Bishops or Pastors of particular Churches, and pretend to be the sole Pastors of the Dioceſs. And yet the jurisdiction of such *Metropolitans*, is of no very ancient date, and quite contrary to the judgment of *Cyprian*, who disowns any *Bishop of Bishops*, and owns only Bishops or Overseers of Flocks or Churches. Others take a great deal of pains to prove the stated presidency of one (by the name of *Bishop*) in a *Consessus* or Bench of *Presbyters*, who had but all one Communicating Church under their charge, which is not deny'd to have begun early in the Church as a Remedy of

Schism.

Schism. But that difference of *Bishop* and *Presbyters*, when both were but joynt-rulers of a Congregation, is so far from being a proof of modern prelacy, that such *Diocesan Bishops* have put down the primitive Parish-Bishops, and monopoliz'd the power of many score, or hundreds of such Bishops to themselves, and thereby rendred true Church-government impracticable. Nay that very difference betwixt the *Bishop* and *Presbyters* of a particular Church, seems to have had it's rise wholly in the notorious disparity of his gifts, learning, age, &c. above the rest, but was never esteemed by them a difference in office or power, nor is it ascrib'd to any higher Original then Human Constitution by *Jerome*, *Austin*, *Ambrose*, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, &c. not to mention elder writers.

If then Ordination belong to Scripturall Bishops, and such be the Pastors of particular Churches, if none else did ordain in the Primitive Church in its purest Ages Then all such Bishops have that power. Nor indeed have any power to ordain, but on the account of their being such Scriptural Bishops. The office of *Diocesan Prelates* being a manifest Usurpation in the Church which had it's rise in human Ambition, That Usurpation cannot rightfully deprive the true Bishops or Pastors of that power of Church-government, which is as essential to their office as the power of teaching or being guides in worship. And whatever may be said for Parish-Bishops, submitting for peace sake, to the usurpation of a *Diocesan*, (*ex: gr.* when he claims the sole power of Ordination) where the true ends of it are attain'd, yet they have no reason to submit to it, when *Diocesan Bishops* shall so abuse that usurped power as to corrupt and deprave the Ministry by imposing sinful terms, and hazard the ruin of Souls by neglecting to provide a number of faithful Pastors suitable to their real necessities. The Ordination therefore of the Pastors or Bishops of particular Churches is more agreeable to the holy Scripture and primitive Antiquity, and consequently more unexceptionably *Valid* then that of a single *Diocesan*.

From whence it follows, That the *ordination* of Pastors in the Presbyterian Churches is *Valid*; because either they are ordain'd

ordain'd by *Dioceſan* Biſhops, who had power to ordain on the account of that office they have in common with *ſcriptural* Biſhops, tho they have none as *Dioceſan*; or they are ordain'd by a concurrence of *ſcriptural* Biſhops, to whoſe office the power of *Ordination* was annext by *divine* Inſtitution, and and cannot be alienated by any *humane* uſurpation. For Chriſt has given none power to change his Inſtitutions. Nor can the *will* of the Ordainers debar his Officers from any part of that Authority which his *Charter* conveys to them. And if the validity of *Ordination* by ſuch ſcriptural Biſhops be deny'd, the *Church* had no ordained Miniſters for a *Century* or two at leaſt.

Having laid down theſe Notions about *Miſſion*, I come to examine D: *M*'s Queſt's.

Queſt: 1: *What prieſthood or holy Orders had the firſt Reformers, but what they received from the hands of Roman Catholick Biſhops?*

Anſw: If D: *M*: mean, that their *prieſthood* or miniſterial office was convey'd to them by the Biſhops, as the *Givers* of it, they receiv'd it from none at all; nor has any that power to *give*; 'tis given by Chriſt in his Charter: But if he mean, that the Roman Catholick, or Popiſh Biſhops did inveſt them in that office. 'Tis own'd, that moſt of the Reformed Miniſters were *ordain'd* by them; and 'tis not material, whether they were Roman Catholick Biſhops of the ſame rigid ſtamp as thoſe of the preſent Age, or no; for the validity of their *Ordination* depends on the *Eſſentials* of the Paſtoral office retain'd, and not on their horrid corruption of it. And as Mr. *K.* well obſerves, they ordain'd as *Chriſtian*, not as *Roman* Biſhops. But what if ſome of the Reformers became Paſtors to the people upon their neceſſities and call, who durſt not comply with the ſinful terms of *Ordination* in the Church of *Rome*, and yet could have no other? They would not be in this caſe deſtitute of a true *Miſſion*: For the evident neceſſities of the peoples ſouls (who earneſtly deſir'd to have the Truths of the Goſpel purely preach'd, and divine Worſhip purely celebrated; and who could not with a ſafe conſcience continue in the Communion of the

Roman

Roman Church), and their Qualifications for ſo neceſſary a work were a ſufficient *ſignification* of the will of Chriſt that they ſhould undertake it. For the precept about the ordinary regular way of Admiſſion to the Miniſtry did not oblige where it cou'd not be lawfully obſerved and where there was a far greater neceſſity of a pure untainted Miniſtry then of that poſitive point of Order. For elſe on ſuppoſition, no Paſtors had embraced the Reformation, The people who did, woud have been obliged to have lived like *Atheists* without publick worſhip.

2 Q: *Who authorized the firſt Reformers to preach their Proteſtant Doctrine, and adminiſter their Proteſtant Sacraments?*

Anſw. It does not belong to the Ordainers to determine what Doctrine the perſon ordained ſhall preach, but to Chriſt who has determined that matter already. And therefore if the Doctrine which our firſt Reformers preacht, and the Sacraments they adminiſtred be *Chriſt's*, as Mr. *K.* well argues, 'tis ridiculous to ask who authoriz'd them to preach the one, or adminiſter the other. *Chriſt did*; and no men can authorize any to preach any *other* Doctrine, or adminiſter any *other* Sacraments. The Biſhops or Prieſts in the *Roman Church* had no right or *Miſſion* from Chriſt to preach *Popiſh* Doctrine, or adminiſter *Popiſh* Sacraments, or celebrate *Popiſh* Worſhip ſo far as theſe are contrary to the Doctrine, Sacraments, and Worſhip contain'd in the Goſpel. Theſe were groſs *corruptions* of their office; and therefore when any of them embrac'd the Reformation, when they begun to preach the Goſpel more purely, and to celebrate divine Worſhip more free from the idolatrous and ſuperſtitious mixtures that had prevail'd in the *Roman Church*, they *reſtor'd* their Miniſtry to its true *uſe*, and ſo far *purg'd* it from that wretched *depravation*. And in this debate Mr. *K* need not be aſham'd to defend either *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or *Zuinglius*. For *Socinus* or his followers, they can produce no *Miſſion* to preach againſt the *Divinity* and *ſatisfaction* of the Son of God, no more than D. *M.* to preach up the *worſhip of Images*, or *invocation of Angels and Saints*, or *Adoration of the Hoſt*, &c.

For the 3*d* and 4*th* Qu. I ſhall joyn them.

Whether Cranmer *and his Aſſociates could condemn the Church of* Rome *by pretence of the Miſſion they received from her Biſhops. If ſo, whether a Presbyterian Miniſter having received Orders from a Proteſtant Biſhop, can by vertue of ſuch Orders pronounce the Church of* England *a corrupt Church?*

'Tis evident both theſe Queſtions are founded on this ridiculous fancy, that the perſon *Ordained* is obliged to conform his Miniſtrations to the judgment or humour of the *Ordainers*. 'Tis true indeed, if in any Church, the Miniſters that are *Ordained* be *obliged* to ſubſcribe a Confeſſion of Faith, or obſerve any publick Rules in their Worſhip, they ought not to be *Ordain'd* on theſe terms, if they think any thing in the Doctrine of that Church, or the Rules of its worſhip contrary to the Doctrine of Chriſt, or the Goſpel Rule of Worſhip. Much leſs ſhould they enter into that *obligation* with a deſign to break it afterwards. This were odious diſſimulation. But if any have been *Ordain'd* in a Church that has obliged them to ſubſcribe certain Articles of Faith, and Rules of Worſhip, which at their *Ordination* they had no ſcruple againſt, and ſhall upon deeper ſtudy find many of thoſe Articles were groſs and dangerous *Errors*, and thoſe Rules of Worſhip *idolatrous* or *ſuperſtitious*, they are not obliged to preach thoſe *Errors*, or practice thoſe *Rules* againſt the dictates of their own conſcience. Nay, if thoſe *errors* and *corruptions* endanger the ſalvation of their Flock, they ought to preach againſt them, and warn ſouls of their danger. And not to do this, is to betray thoſe ſouls, to deſert the cauſe and teſtimony of *Chriſt*, and fail of that fidelity he expects in the diſcharge of their office. They ought to do all in their *ſphere* towards a Reformation; and if they ſhould be *ſuſpended* for the doing that which *Chriſt* has made their duty, the *ſuſpenſion* is unjuſt and *null*, as being oppoſite to the laws and intereſt of *Chriſt*, and is indeed a *Rebellion* againſt him. If therefore the Doctrines and Worſhip of the *Roman Church* were pernicious, and endangered the ſalvation of ſouls, and our Reformers had juſt ground to account them ſuch, they were bound by the laws of Chriſt to preach againſt them, and

warn

warn the people of them, and in their *ſphere* attempt a Reformation. Nor would any *ſuſpenſion* or *excommunication* of thoſe Popiſh Biſhops that *Ordain'd* them, juſtify their deſerting their Miniſtry, and betraying the intereſt of *Chriſt* and ſouls. And they might do this without aſſuming any *Authority* over the Church of *Rome*; they only refuſed *ſubjection* to her *unjuſt impoſitions*. And ſo may *Presbyterian* Miniſters refuſe ſubjection to the *ſinful impoſitions* of thoſe *Prelates* that *Ordain'd* them, and are not obliged to lay down their Office when ever their *Ordainers* ſhall unjuſtly ſilence them, as we proved before.

But Mr. *K.* I perceive likes not this Anſwer, and therefore chooſes to juſtify the *Church* of *Engl.* upon narrower grounds; And therefore in his Rep'y to theſe Queſtions;

1. He grants that, *A Presbyter or Biſhop ought not to preach againſt the Conſtitution of the Church whereof they are Members.*

2. He aſſerts, *This was not the Reformers Caſe*, and therefore he founds the *lawfulneſs* of the Reformation entirely upon its being made by the *Convocation*, in whom he ſuppoſes the *ſupreme Church-Government lodged in this Nation.*

Had Mr. *K.* only argued, that the Reformation in *England* was not only *lawful*, but effected in the moſt *regular* way with the concurrence of the Civil Magiſtrate upon the advice of ſo conſiderable a part of the Clergy; none could have blam'd him for taking in all the conſiderations that prove the Reformation in *England* to have been the moſt unexceptionably regular and orderly. But that in his eager zeal to defend the *Prelates* of the *Church of England* in *ſilencing* their *brethren*, he ſhould make ſuch a *Conceſſion* to the *Papiſts* as may be uſed againſt the Reformation elſewhere with ſo great advantage, was not *ingenuous*. But we muſt excuſe him that he had rather wound the *Reformed Churches* abroad, than not gratify his ſpleen againſt the *Presbyterians at home*, and car'd not whom he made *Schiſmaticks*, provided he faſtned that character on his *Brethren*.

Let us therefore examine this Conceſſion of his, *p.* 27. *A Presbyter or Biſhop ought not to preach againſt the Conſtitution*

of that Church of which they are members. The reaſon he gives is, *Becauſe there is a regular way wherein they may endeavour a Reformation*, viz. *If they find any thing amiſs in her Doctrine or Diſcipline, they may make their application for the redreſs of it to thoſe that have power to reform it, but muſt not preſume, being ſubjects, to uſurp their Governors power.*

But what if their Governors refuſe to reform, and ſilence thoſe that deſire, or in their own ſphere attempt it? All the anſwer is,

But if ſuch a Biſhop or Presbyter be cenſur'd and ſuſpended, he is thereby diſcharg'd from the execution of his Office, and he muſt no more make a Schiſm to regain it, than one muſt make a Rebellion in the State to regain a Civil Office. This we urge, and I think with reaſon againſt the Presbyterians and other Sects among us, that either have no Ordination or appointment to their Offices from the Church of England *or* Ireland, *or elſe abuſe the power againſt her, which was once given them by her, and from which they are again legally ſuſpended. And as we urge this againſt them, ſo likewiſe againſt D.* M. *&c.*

Let us briefly conſider the *Conſequences* of this Conceſſion, and the *grounds* of it.

1. Its *Conſequences.*

The firſt *Proteſtant* Paſtors in *France*, and moſt other parts of *Europe* were before the *Reformation* members of thoſe Churches where they lived, and ſubject to their Governors; they had received *Ordination* by the hands of *Popiſh* Prelates. God was pleaſed ſo to bleſs their ſtudies, and ſearch after truth, that they begun to diſcover abundance of groſs and pernicious errors in the Doctrine, and a wretched mixture of *Idolatry* and *Superſtition* in the worſhip of the *Church* they lived in. What ſhould they do? they were but particular *Presbyters*, and therefore ſhould not according to Mr. *K*'s principle *preach againſt the Conſtitution of the Church which gave them their Office.* Many of them try'd his remedy; they repreſented theſe things to their Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, as *Luther* to the *Archbiſhop* of *Mentz*, and the *Biſhop* of *Brandenburg*, and the *Pope* himſelf. But they ſoon learnt by dear experience, how averſe the *Court* of

of *Rome* was to any Reformation, and how little it was to be expected from the *Prelates*, who either had no *will*, or no *courage* to attempt a Reformation againſt the will of the Pope. *Luther* and all his *followers* inſtead of prevailing with thoſe that had the conduct of the Church were *excommunicated* as *Hereticks*. Now according to Mr. *K*'s principle, theſe Reformers *being cenſured and ſuſpended by the Prelates to whom they were ſubject, were diſcharged from the execution of their Office, and ſhould no more have made a Schiſm in the Church to regain it, than one muſt make a Rebellion in the State to regain a Civil Office*.. And ſince they did not deſert their Office, but went on to preach againſt the Conſtitution of the *Romiſh Church*, and the will of their Superiors the Popiſh Prelates, they were no better than *Schiſmaticks* and *Church-Rebels*; Nay, if his Notion of the *Catholick Church* be true, the people that ſeparated from the Popiſh Prelates, and adher'd to their excommunicated Paſtors, ceaſt to be members of the body of Chriſt. And how great a part of the Reformed Churches and their Paſtors fall under this heavy charge? And will Mr. *K*. own all theſe unavoidable conſequences upon mature deliberation? What if we ſhould once more have a *Popiſh Convocation* in *England*, and theſe ſhould reſtore the *Romiſh Religion*, and *ſuſpend* all the preſent *Pariſh-Miniſters* (whom Mr. *K*. thinks now lawful Paſtors), According to his Principle they being but *Preſbyters, and the Biſhops Subjects*, muſt not *preach againſt the Conſtitution of the Church of* England, declaring her judgment by a Convocation in whom *the ſupreme Government of the Church is lodg'd*; they muſt therefore ceaſe their Miniſtry, and *no more make a Schiſm by the exerciſe of it, than they muſt make a Rebellion in the State to regain a Civil Office*. Nay, to ſeparate from ſuch Governors of the Church of *England*, will prove thoſe that do it no *Catholick members of the Church*. The ſame principles may be apply'd to the *Arrians*, who got Imperial Councils, and conſequently the Government of the Imperial Church into their hands, and for ſuch Paſtors as *Athanaſius* to preach againſt *Arrianiſm* which was then the Doctrine of the Church was *Schiſm* and *Church-Rebellion*; In a word, Accordnig

ding to theſe Principles, 'Tis in the power of a *Convocation* to damn many thouſand ſouls by *ſuſpending* an Orthodox, and *ſubſtituting* a corrupt Miniſtry; and for thoſe Orthodox Paſtors when *ſuſpended* to endeavour their ſalvation by the exercise of their Miniſtry, is to be *Schiſmaticks* and *Church Rebels*. And what is this leſs than to ſet up the *will* of ſuch *Church-Governors* above the *will* and *laws* of *Chriſt*, above the *Salvation* of *Souls*, and above the *Intereſt of Truth and Holineſs*. Therefore,

3. Let us examine the *Grounds* of this ſtrange Aſſertion, viz. *Becauſe there is a regular way for reforming abuſes, And for particular Presbyters to do it againſt the will of the Biſhops whoſe Subjects they are, is like reforming abuſes in the ſtate, in ſpight of the King, a remedy generally worſe then the diſeaſe, &c.*

Anſw. 1. All that theſe reaſons prove is, that Reformation ſhou'd be firſt ſought by humble addreſſing to our Superiors. But Mr. *K.* plainly leaves it impoſſible if they refuſe.

2. They are founded on this wretched miſtake, that the Authority of *Biſhops* in the *Church* does reſemble that of a *King* in the *State*, and ſo to reform abuſes in the Church againſt their will, is like reforming abuſes in the State, in ſpight of the *King*. Whereas tis *Chriſt*'s Authority in the Church that does reſemble the *King*'s in the State. And therefore if he wou'd rightly ſtate the compariſon, it runs thus; *Chriſt* the *King* of his Church, requires all his *Officers* to preach the pure Doctrine and adminiſter the pure inſtitutions deliver'd in his Goſpel (which is his univerſal law,) Let us ſuppoſe, there are in this or that particular part of the Church dangerous corruptions crept in, The law of Chriſt obliges theſe his officers to diſown them and reform them, but the Major part of theſe will not, but preſume to ſilence thoſe that do it according to his command. Now the *Queſt*: is whether thoſe that *obey* the command of *Chriſt* be the *Rebells* againſt him, or thoſe that neither will obey his commands themſelves, nor allow others to do ſo. One wou'd think, that ſuch as refuſe to reform and ſilence all that in their own place attempt it, according to the tenour of their Commiſſion, are like to prove the *Church Rebells*. But no

doubt

doubt the Paſtors of a Church may diſown and excommunicate one that abuſes his office to the perverting the Church, and for him to continue to pervert the *Church* by ſuch *male-administration* is to *Rebell* againſt Chriſt and his laws. The charge of *Rebellion* therefore muſt ariſe from the violation of *Chriſt's* Authority, not mens, which the *Major* part of Paſtors may be guilty of in a Nation as well as the leſſer.

3 He ſeems to confound a *private* and a *publick* Reformation.

4. The Reaſon given, why a Biſhop or Presbyter when cenſur'd, is diſcharg'd from his Office, viz. *Becauſe to regain it is like making a Rebellion to regain a Civil Office* does ſuppoſe two great miſtakes.

1. That the *Ordainers* give a *Spiritual* office in the *Church* as the *King* gives a *Civil* office in the *State*; And this is no leſs a miſtake then to ſet the *Ordainers* in the place of *Chriſt*. Tis *his* Charter gives the *ſacred* office as the *King's* does the *Civil*, and the *Ordainers* do but for orders ſake approve and ceremonially inveſt the perſon as the *Recorder* does the *Mayor* of a *Town* whom the *Burgheſſes* chooſe. And herein Mr. *K.* ſeems to own that very *error* which is the ground of all Mr. *M's* impertinent Queſtions.

2. He ſuppoſes, that the *Biſhops* who ordain *Presbyters*, have equal power to depoſe them from their *Miniſterial office* as the *King* has to take away a *Civill Commiſſion*. And thus, *p.* 27. he tells us, *That the preſent Diſſenters were the Biſhops ſubjects, accountable to them as their Superiors, and liable to be diſcharg'd from their office, and the beneſits of the Communion of the Church by their Cenſure.*

Whereas Tis plain, that it is the Charter of *Chriſt* gives the *ſacred* office as the *King's* does the *Civil*; And as none can take a *Civil Commiſſion* given by the *King* to any Subject, but by the *King's orders and Command*: So none can take away that *ſpiritual* Commiſſion Chriſt has given any officer in his Church but by his *orders*. But now he has given none leave or Authority to depoſe his officers, but for evident *Male-adminiſtration*, as *preaching Hereſie, groſs ſcandal, &c.* And if in any part of his Church,

Church, The *Major* number of Paſtors ſhou'd depoſe the *Minor* for doing their duty, or without a juſt cauſe, their doing ſo is, a bold and wicked uſurpation, for which they may expect their Lord will call them to an account, as he threatens the *evil ſervant, who unmindfull of his Lord's coming, begun to ſmite his fellow ſervants*, 24. *Matth.* 48, 49: But for the innocent Paſtors thus wrongfully depoſed, to diſobey their uſurping depoſers, is to *obey* Chriſt, who never warranted them to deſert their office, and betray Souls, becauſe they are unjuſtly forbidden to do what his charter has made their duty. 'Tis therefore the *unjuſt depoſers* are the *Rebells* againſt Chriſt, and their *uſurpation* is, as if the *Mayor* of a *County town* ſhou'd without any orders from the King, preſume to turn out all the *Mayors* of the *particular Corporations* in that *County* at his own pleaſure; and I imagine the *King* wou'd in all probability take him for the Rebell who wou'd thus under pretence of his Authority, uſurp a power never given him, and exerciſe it to the violation of his Charter, and the Laws of the Land. This is the true ſtate of the Caſe, and Mr. *K*'s miſtakes about it are ſo palpable, that 'tis a wonder how a man of his judgment cou'd fall into them. And I muſt needs add here, that as the *Diſſenters* were never the Biſhops *Subjects* as they are any officers of *Chriſt*, and Mr. *K* will never prove them to be ſo; So they will be more afraid of ſubmitting to their *uſurpation*, if they arrogate to themſelves ſuch an unlimited power of depoſing his undoubted officers, particular, Church Biſhops, and claim a blind obedience to their depoſing Sentence, be it right or wrong. And 'tis but fidelity to our Lord, to diſown ſuch palpable and dangerous uſurpation.

The grounds then of Mr. *K*'s principles being falſe, they will not ſerve him to condemn the *Presbyterian* Miniſters as either *Schiſmaticks* or *Church-Rebels*, and the charge is likelier to fall heavy on *thoſe* that preſum'd to ſuſpend them againſt the known laws of Chriſt, from whom they received their Commiſſion. Mr. *K*. very gravely takes for granted, what he will never prove.

1. *That the Convocation are by the laws of Chriſt, the Supreme*

preme Governours of all the Christians in England.

2. *That either the Convocation did justly, according to the laws of Christ, suspend the Nonconforming Ministers, or that an absolute obedience, was due to their Censure whether just or unjust.*

1. He takes it for granted, *That the Convocation, are by the Laws of Christ, the supreme Governours of all the Christians in England.*

Does not Mr. *K.* know, that the *Divines* of his own Church are not agreed about this matter. The *Reverend* Dr. *Stilling:* when posed by Mr. *Baxter* about this Quest. *Who was the Ecclesiastical governing Head of the Church of England, as one body politick,* does very fairly deny that the Church of England has any such *Head* or *Regent part,* nay denies the necessity of such an *Head.* So that according to him, the Church of England can be no Politicall Church made up of a *Governing* and a *governed* part; And consequently all the noise of it's *Government Constitutions and Laws* as such a politicall Church, is at an end. But now Mr. *K.* comes and tells us without Scruple, *That the supreme Government of our Church, has always been in a National Counsel or convocation of our Clergy.* If so, I wou'd gladly know, whether Mr. *K:* does think that the laws or Canons of a Convocation, wou'd oblige the Consciences of all the Christians in England, tho they were not enacted and ratified by the civill Authority? If they wou'd not, 'tis evident, that the Church of England has no Ecclesiastical *Head* of Government, because none that can make laws obligatory to all the Christians in England; And so the Convocation are but the *King's Ecclesiastical Council* (which is indeed the true Notion of them) to advise him what Laws he shall establish by civil Authority, relating to Church Government. If he say, the Canons of the Convocation wou'd oblige, whether the civil Authority ratified them or no; I ask *Quo jure.* All obligation to obey any Church-governors as such, must arise from the command of Christ. Now where has he commanded, that in every Nation such a *small* part of the Clergy, as our Convocation consists of, shall be supreme Governours of all the *rest.* When perhaps, they are as

Ureus: of Seper: *p:* 127, 128.

unfit to repreſent the judgment of all the *Paſtors* (not to mention the *people*) in *England*, as the *Council of Trent* all the *Churches* in *Europe*. I am confident, beſides the 2000 ſilenced Miniſters, the far greater part of the *Conforming Clergy* would never have conſented to all the late excommunicating Canons, had their Vote been requir'd. And the chief members of the Convocation are ſo far from being Chriſt's Officers, that I deſpair their ever defending the lawfulneſs, and much more the divine right of their Office againſt Mr. *Baxter*'s Arguments in his foreſaid *Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy*. Neither the light of nature, nor general laws of Scripture would ſuggeſt ſuch an Aſſembly as the governing Head of the Church of *England*. A duly elected Synod of Paſtors in a Nation to endeavour the neareſt Unity and Concord of the particular Churches (as far as 'tis to be expected on earth) by their amicable conſultations we grant to be moſt deſirable and eligible wherever it may be had; and the judgment of ſuch a Synod ſhould be comply'd with in all things not repugnant to the word of God. But we cannot ſay ſo of an Aſſembly compos'd chiefly of men, whoſe Office is not only an Uſurpation, but ſuch as renders true Church-government impoſſible, and whoſe intereſt and grandure inclines them to keep up the diviſions and corruptions which they have made. And to ſuch a *Convocation's* being entruſted by Chriſt with the National Church-government, which Mr. *K.* is pleaſed to aſſert, I oppoſe the judgment of the truly learned *Archbiſhop Uſher* which he often profeſt to Mr. *Baxter*, viz. *That Church-Councils are not for Government, but for Unity; Not as being in order of Government over the ſeveral Biſhops, but that by conſultation they may know their duty more clearly, and by agreement maintain Unity, and to that end they were anciently celebrated.*

2. *Mr. K.* takes it for granted alſo, *That either the Convocation did juſtly according to the laws of Chriſt ſuſpend the Nonconforming Miniſters, or that thoſe Miniſters were bound however to obey their ſentence, whether right or wrong.*

For the *firſt*, If he will indeed prove their ſilencing to have been juſt, *i. e.* that the *Non-conforming Miniſters* were guilty of

of ſuch *male-adminiſtration* as forfeited their office, and warranted the Prelates by the laws of Chriſt to depoſe them, I will aſſure him, they will quit their office rather than rebel againſt Chriſt, or any juſt depoſing ſentence of men. But I have already prov'd the ſentence to be unjuſt: And the ſilencing ſuch a number of Miniſters on ſuch grounds, was a crime of that nature, that I would in charity to Mr. *K.* warn him to draw the guilt of it no further on his own head, by undertaking to juſtify or defend it.

For the *Second*, That theſe Miniſters, tho unjuſtly ſuſpended, were bound to obey the ſentence, is to give the ſuſpenders the ſame abſolute Authority claim'd by Popiſh Prelates and Councils; and on the ſame grounds, all the Proteſtant Miniſters in *France* and other Reformed Churches were bound to ceaſe their Miniſtry when firſt ſuſpended by Popiſh Prelates, and ſo their *Reformation* was only founded on *Church-Rebellion.* Nay, if this be true, it will be in the power of a Convocation in *England* by impoſing ſuch ſinful terms of Church-Communion as few of the people dare ſubmit to, and ſilencing all the Paſtors that will not approve of them, to oblige the greateſt part of the Nation to live without the publick worſhip of God (as the Popes did ſometimes thus *interdict* a whole Kingdom). And he that can believe this, may next be perſwaded, that Chriſt has put the power of damning men into the hands of a Convocation, and the people muſt not endeavour their own ſalvation againſt the will of ſuch a Convocation, tho even the *Apoſtles* themſelves had no *power but for Edification.*

4 Queſt. *Whether an Act of Parliament be not as good in* France, Spain, *or* Germany *for the Popiſh Religion, as in* England *for Proteſtancy?*

Anſw. Mr. *K.* juſtly ſaith, that 'tis not ſufficient the Power which eſtabliſhes a Religion be competent, and the methods of ſettling it regular; but 'tis likewiſe neceſſary the Religion it ſelf be true, *p.* 33. No humane laws can juſtly eſtabliſh a falſe

Religion, because God has given no man power to contradict his Revelation and Laws. And tho subjection be due to the Magistrate, yet his Authority cannot oblige us to *formal* obedience, when he commands us to profess Error, or practice false Worship, or forbids us to *confess with the mouth what we believe with the heart to salvation.*

The only Quest. here is, Whether the Popish or the Protestant Religion be the more agreeable to the holy Scriptures the only infallible Test of all revealed Religion? Which Quest. D: *Manby* shou'd have attempted to resolve by coming to the merits of the Cause, and entring into a particu'ar discussion of the Controversies betwixt the Church of *Rome* and those that have embrac'd the Reformation. Had he done this, he might have spar'd all these impertinent Questions about *Mission*, which are but as Mr. *K.* calls them, meer *Banter*, and contriv'd only to divert people from a necessary enquiry into the principles of the Popish Religion.

Only there is one passage that occasionally drops from Mr. *K*'s Pen in answer to this last Quest. which I would take notice of, *p.* 33. *'Tis one principle of the Christian Religion, that the Professors thereof ought to associate into a body, and that Christ the Author thereof has appointed Governors who are to descend by succession, and that to these regularly appointed, due obedience is to be paid, as men value the rewards and punishments of another life.*

'Tis strange to me that Mr. *K.* should think any man able to know what he meant by these words.

If he means, that all the Christians throughout the world must associate in a General Council to set up some universal Officers that shall govern the Church-Catholick as as one *political* society subject to them, or that the Church-Catholick must become one body by a subjection to any humane Head, Pope, Council, or Colledge of Prelates, this is plainly to set up a *Vice-Christ*, and to make a humane center of Unity to the *Catholick Church*, which he seems honestly to disclaim, *p.* 55. If he mean not thus, why does he talk of Governors appointed to this Catholick body. So for these Governors descending by succes-

ſucceſſion, if he mean that none are lawful Governors but ſuch as can plead an *uninterrupted ſucceſſion of Prelatical Ordination*, as Mr. *Dodwell* ſeems to dream), it will hence follow, that 'tis a meer uncertainty whether there be any lawful Governors in the Church at all; and if ſuch Prelates were not known in the primitive Church, either they or the ſucceeding Ages had no lawful Governors. So when he makes obedience due to theſe Governors, as men value the rewards or puniſhments of another life; I hope he means obedience to them ſo far as they deliver thoſe laws of Chriſt which he enforces with that ſolemn ſanction; and not obedience to every unneceſſary or ſinful injunction of their own. And I hope he will not think that Chriſt has appointed ſuch our Governors, whoſe very office he never inſtituted.

And if the meaning of this fine Principle be no more than this, that all Chriſtians muſt unite in Chriſt as their Head, and all endeavour to live under ſuch Paſtors as he has inſtituted, and the Paſtors endeavour all neceſſary Concord by their mutual conſultations, and be careful to provide ſuch as ſhall ſucceed them in the ſame office; and that to diſobey ſuch Paſtors when they urge the neceſſary Doctrines and Laws of *Chriſt*, is to forfeit the rewards, and incurr the puniſhments of another life; then indeed I ſee no danger in this Principle. But without all this allowance and explication, it has a very dangerous ſound, and Mr. *K.* was not aware what uſe D. *Manby* might make of it.

For the 2*d* and 3*d* Points of Mr. *M*'s Paper about *Auricular Confeſſion*, and the *Catholick Church*, Mr. *K*'s Anſwer is ſo judicious and clear, (bating a paſſage or two that relate to his ſchiſmatical Notion of the Catholick Church) that I ſhall not needleſly undertake what he has ſo well perform'd. The ſame I may ſay concerning his Anſwer to that wild diſcourſe of the Dean's in vindication of the Church of *Rome*, and accuſation of the Reformed, except what Mr. *K.* has, *p.* 79, 80, 81, 82. which runs on the miſtakes I have already animadverted on. And 'tis ſtrange Mr. *K.* ſhould, *p.* 82. quote; *Phil.* 3. 15. to that purpoſe he there does, which may be applied to the quite

contra-

contrary with far greater advantage, as the Anſwerers of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Sermon have at large evinc'd. The *Rule* the Apoſtle there ſpeaks of, is, what *God* has preſcrib'd to his Church, not the *unneceſſary*, and much leſs the *ſinful Canons* of men. And for thoſe that are *otherwiſe minded*, he leaves them to God's inſtruction, and does not immediately go about to open their eyes by an *excommunication ipſo facto*, much leſs by a *Writ de Excom. capiendo*. And if other Church-governors had uſed the ſame forbearance, there had been fewer *Schiſms* and *Diviſions* in the Chriſtian world.

For Mr. *K*'s Anſwer to the *Latin* Queſtions, there occurrs nothing in them diſagreeable to the common Proteſtant Doctrine, which does not refer to the forementioned miſtakes.

Having (Honoured Sir) offered you my ſenſe of theſe paſſages in Mr. *K*'s Anſwer, wherein I thought his immoderate affection to a Party perverted his judgment; I ſhall now put an end to this long Letter, by a few reflections on theſe matters.

1. I cou'd heartily wiſh Mr. *K*. and all that approve theſe paſſages in his Book, to conſider ſeriouſly, Whether they are acted by true Chriſtian charity and love, whilſt they deny ſo many Chriſtian Churches in theſe Kingdoms living under the Paſtoral care of *Orthodox* and *pious* Miniſters never *juſtly* ſilenc'd, to be any part of the Catholick Church; and that upon ſuch Principles as paſs the ſame hard cenſure on all the Reformed Churches that were ſet up as ſeparate from Popiſh National Churches? To *unchurch* true Churches, is the moſt oppoſite to that love which is the life of Chriſtian Unity, and is the higheſt degree of *Schiſm*. How much more to unchurch ſo many, and thoſe ſo eminent for the purity of Faith, Worſhip, and Practice; nay, for their charity too towards thoſe parts of the Catholick Church that are leſs pure than themſelves. I ſhould heartily rejoyce if any one could ſhew me any Churches on this earth wherein there is a more pure, peaceable and credible profeſſion of *Chriſtianity* made (as to its integrals as well as eſſentials) than in thoſe *Reformed Churches abroad*, and thoſe at *home*, which I have here been obliged to defend

defend from the Aſſau'lt of a Proteſtant Divine. I am farr from denying our Pariſh Churches to be true parts of the *Catholick* Church, and I hope all that account themſelves obliig'd on the reaſons ſuggeſted in this Paper to frequent other Chriſtian Societies do eſteem them as ſuch, and own all the credible profeſſion of Religion made among them. Tho there are many things wherein they cou'd deſire them reform'd, eſpecially they cou'd wiſh them that liberty of conſenting to their own Paſtors which was the general practice of the Catholick Church in its pureſt Ages, and was confirm'd by the judgment of ſo many Councils; See Mr. *Baxters* church Hiſtory paſſim, and his Anſw. to Dr. *Stillingfl. p.* 128, 129, &c: and *Blondel, de jure plebis, &c.* And they would be glad to ſee ſome tolerable exerciſe of that true and *godly diſcipline* which the *Common-prayer book* acknowledges was practic'd in the *primitive Church*, and the reſtoration whereof, it ſaith, *is much to be wiſhed.* But the miſchief is, tho they have a profeſt aſſent and conſent to this, 'tis only to *wiſh it*, for they have *ſworn* to *endeavour no alteration* how deſirable ſoever.

2 I wou'd hope that long experience will convince us all of the neceſſity of more large aud comprehenſive terms of Chriſtian Concord, as farr as that is to be expected or attain'd on earth. I hope the Churches unity, will no more be lay'd by *Proteſtants* on ſuch humane Canons as are not only *unneceſſary* but contrary to the Churches intereſt and edification. Nor the breach of ſuch a ſinful unity, be branded as *Schiſm and Church-Rebellion*, Mr. *Hales* of Eaton and Dr. *Stillingfleet* (once) were of another mind, and lay'd the charge of *Schiſm*, in all ſuch caſes at the right Door, *viz.* the Impoſers.

3. Tho I can expect no perfect cure of our diviſions (unleſs the Churches in theſe Nations were cemented on a more wide and Catholick foundation, I mean not the ſchiſmatical terms of the Roman Church) Yet I wou'd humbly propoſe it to the Conſideration, both of the ſober charitable *Conformiſts* and *Nonconformiſts*, whether ſomething may not be done to promote ſome conſiderable degrees of *Concord* even while the differences of our *judgment* and *practice* do remain.

May

May they not publickly declare, they own each others Assemblies, for true Christian Churches? May not their members to testifie a true *Catholick* charity maintain occasional *Communion*? shou'd it not be own'd schismatical on either hand to confine that part of *Christ's Catholick Church* which is in these Kingdoms to either party? May not the Pastors own each other for true Ministers of the Gospel, and Pastors to such as consent to their Pastoral relation? (I speak of such as want not the necessary qualifications) May they not rejoyce in the success of each others labours for promoting that common Interest of Christianity wherein both are agreed? For sure that ought to be infinitely dearer to us then the narrow Interest of a party, or the Interest of more dubious Opinions and modes of Worship. May they not concur to promote each others just esteem and reputation in order to the success of their labours? May they not maintain a more amicable correspondence in order to a nearer union of their affections and if possible of their judgment and practice too? May they not forbear unjust Calumnies and reviling language to render each other odious? May they not love and honour in each other whatever there appears of the Image of their Lord and Master his gifts and graces? *May* they not both joyn in the defence of the Reformed Religion upon the common principles wherein the Protestant Churches agreed? And would not so much of mutual affection and concord tend more to credit true *Religion* and strengthen its real Interest, then the contrary uncharitable narrow and irreconcileable Temper? *I* doubt not but the truly moderate on both sides are acted by this truly *Catholick* and Christian Temper; And it wou'd be a comfortable presage to these Churches to see this temper more generally diffus'd and prevalent among us. But for those that will still fancy Christ has every where committed the government of his church to *Diocesan* Prelates and by catholick *Unity* mean a *subjection* to all their cannons and censures, and make all disobedience to *their* commands when contrary to the commands of *Christ*, *Schism and Church Rebellion*, They may long talk of *Catholick* Unity and Peace, But they are next to the *Papists* the most dangerous enemies of it; For they have too

deep

deep a tincture of their humour who make a mighty noiſe about *Unity* but when we come to enquire where it lies, They mean a ſubjection to a certain *Gentleman* that dwells at *Rome*, or at beſt to that *Clergy* who adhere to him in all the corruptions of Chriſtian Doctrine worſhip and Practice.

Laſtly, I wou'd adviſe all of Mr. *K*'s mind to conſider well the *Catholick* principles ſuggeſted in this paper (in oppoſition to his *ſchiſmatical ones*) to the *caſe* of a *popiſh convocation* in *Eng.* or *Irel.* ſhou'd ſuch a convocation ſuſpend him from *preaching his proteſtant doctrine & adminiſtring prot. ſacraments* (as D. *M.* calls them) and he go on to do it, By his own Notions he wou'd be a *ſchiſmatick and Church-Rebel*, by *mine* a faithful paſtor to his Flock and a *Loyal* ſubject of Jeſus Chriſt. And therefore whether *his* principles or *mine* be more *honeſt*, more agreeable to the holy Scriptures more ſerviceable to advance the Authority and Intereſt of Chriſt, more conducive to the welfare of Souls, I leave to his own conſcience to determine on ſecond thoughts; And doubt not but moſt of his own Brethren will acknowledge *mine to be ſo.*

I cannot but reflect on theſe debates with deep regret that I am put on ſo unhappy neceſſity, not only of oppoſing Mr. *K.* but ſaying ſo much againſt the preſent *Church-Goverment* in order to the Vindication of the *Reformed* Churches both *at home* and *abroad*, and the *Truth* it ſelf. But as theſe principles I have here reflected on have been the fatal *Engines* of *Church Tyranny* and *diviſions* theſe many *Ages*, and belong to the *Roman Arſenall*, ſo tis the neceſſary work of a *Peacemaker* who propoſes a *Catholick* Unity and Love as his great aim to batter them down. I had not ſo long delay'd the ſending this paper; but that I ſtill hoped ſome abler pen would have undertaken what mine is ſo unfit for, However I hope I have aſſerted nothing contrary either to *Truth* or *Peace*, or if I have, I am willing to receive better Information.

I am

Sir.

Your moſt humble &c.

A POSTSCRIPT.

THe perſon to whom the Letter was addreſs'd deſiring me to publiſh it, I thought it requiſite upon a review of it, to add a few things relating to ſome paſſages in it. The oppoſition of Mr. *K*'s Notion of the *Catholick Church* to the Articles of the *Church* of *Ireland*, and the agreeableneſs of mine to them is obſerv'd in the Preface.

To what is ſaid about Mr. *K*'s mark of the *Catholick Church*, *viz.* [*living under lawful ſpiritual Governors*;] I add, that this renders the relation of all true Chriſtians to our bleſſed Lord (as his members) as queſtionable as the title of the Paſtor under whom they live; and conſequently expoſes their right to all the benefits of the Goſpel, even to the Kingdom of Heaven it ſelf to the ſame uncertainties and doubts as the regularity of his Admiſſion to his Office. And if thoſe ancient *Canons* repeated in ſo many *Councils* be of any force, which declare all Elections of the *Clergy* by *Magiſtrates*, or *without the conſent of the people*, void; what a deſperate caſe has almoſt all the *Chriſtian world* been in ever ſince the old way of Elections was alter'd! Nay, the *Church* of *England* it ſelf, where the *Biſhops* are choſen by the *King*, and *Parſons* by *Patrons*, is in a miſerable plight. So ſevere is this mark of the *Catholick Church* on thoſe for whoſe ſecular intereſt Mr. *K.* ſeems to have calculated it, and ſo over-favourable to thoſe whom he deſign'd to exclude from the *Catholick Church* by it.

For what is ſaid on behalf of all the *Reformed Churches*, *p.* 11, *&c.* It is not intended to include the *Socinians*, who deny an eſſential Article of the *Chriſtian Faith*, the *Deity of Chriſt*, and all the Doctrines of his *Satisfaction*, *&c.* that depend on it.

Againſt Mr. *K*'s Notion of the Supreme Government over all the Chriſtians in *England* being lodg'd in the *Convocation* touch'd on, *p.* 57*th.* I add this Argument *ad hominem*; The *General Aſſembly* in *Scotland* have equal pretenſions to the Supreme Government of all Chriſtians in that Nation, as the *Convocation*

vocation has in *England*. Now if the laws of the *Convocation* would oblige the Conſciences of all the Chriſtians in *England* (as the laws of the Church) whether ratified by the Civil Authority or no, then the Acts of the General Aſſembly in *Scotland* have the ſame force there; Now that General Aſſembly which ſat there in the year 1639. (whoſe Acts were alſo ratified afterwards by King *Ch.* the Firſt in perſon, preſent in his Parliament there) aboliſht Prelacy, and ſet up the Presbyterian Government there. The Prelates were, according to Mr. *K*'s Principles, diſcharg'd from their Office, and ſince they regain'd it not only without the allowance of any General Aſſembly, but againſt the Acts or Laws of all that ſat there ſince, they were therein guilty of *Schiſm* or *Church Rebellion*. Mr. *K*'s Notions are as unmercyful to the *Biſhops* there as to *Presbyters* here: So little does he regard where thoſe envenom'd darts may fall, which he levels againſt his Diſſenting Brethren.

The Contents of the Letter

MR. M's 1 *Queſt. in the Preface, What is meant by the* Catholick Church. *Mr.* K's *Anſwer conſider'd, and evidenc'd to be obſcure, narrow, and conſequently ſchiſmatical and dangerous, from* p. 2 *to* p. 7.

The true Anſwer to that Queſtion. p 7, 8, 9, 10.

Mr. M's 2d *and* 3d *Queſtions. Mr.* K's *Anſwer enlarg'd, to make it more Catholick and comprehenſive.* p. 10, 11.

Mr. M's 4th *Queſt. Whether by the* Catholick Church *be meant the variety of all Proteſtants ſince they deny her eſſential mark, Unity? The true Catholick Anſwer propoſed,* p. 11, 12, 13.

Mr. K's *Anſwer to that Queſtion conſider'd; His three marks of the Catholick members of the Church examin'd. His firſt* [*Embracing the Catholick Faith*] *allow'd. His ſecond* [*Living in Charity with their neighbour Churches*] *excludes the Papiſts, Mr.* Dodwel, *and himſelf, and a great part of the Chriſtian world in the preſent and former Ages. His third mark* [*Making no ſeparation from their lawful Governors*] *founded on his ſchiſmatical Notion of the Catholick Church. Two Queſtions propos'd on that Head.* 1. *Whether the ſeparation of the Presbyterians,* &c. (*ſuppoſing it to be ſinful*) *will exclude them from being Catholick members of the Church? That it does not, prov'd from the nature of their ſeparation, being only a breach of humane Unity: The contrary Aſſertion excludes the* Engliſh Convocation,

the

the Papists, and the greatest part of the Christian Church in every Age from living Catholick members, &c. from p. 16. to p. 20:

2: Upon what grounds does Mr: K. assert that the Presbyterians have made a sinful separation from their lawful Governors? Some difficulties proposed on that Head; That the Presbyt: Ministers are lawful Pastors to the Churches under their oversight, prov'd, from p. 21, to p. 30:

The Q's in the Pamphlet about Mission. The true Notion of Mission stated: The Authority and Obligation of Pastors to the duties of their Office derived from Christ's Charter: The use of Pastoral Ordination: Its absolute necessity to the being of the Ministry disprov'd: The power of Ordination belongs to scriptural Bishops: Such Bishops prov'd to be the Pastors of single Congregations, not Dioceses, from Scripture and Antiquity: The Ordination of Presbyt. Ministers at home and abroad, hence vindicated, from p. 38. to p: 48: These premis'd.

Mr. M's 1 Qu. What Priesthood or holy Orders had the first Reformers but what they received from Rom. Cath. Bishops? Answered. p: 48, 49

His 2 Q. Who authorized the first Reformers to Preach their Protestant Doctrine, and administer their Protestant Sacraments? Answered, and retorted on the Church of Rome. p. 49:

His 3d and 4th Q's; Whether Cranmer and his Associates could condemn the Church of Rome by vertue of the Mission derived from her Bishops; If so, whether a Presbyt: Minister having received Orders from a Protestant Bishop, can by vertue of such Orders pronounce the Church of England a corrupt Church? Answered. p: 50, 51:

Mr. K's Answer examined: His Concession to D. M. [That a Bishop or Presbyter ought not to preach against the Constitution of the Church he is a member of; and if he be censured or suspended, he is discharg'd, &c.] consider'd, The consequences of it pernicious to a great part of the Reformed Churches, and to our own, had we a Popish Convocation. The grounds of it absurd and false. The silenc'd NC. Ministers not chargeable with Schism or Church-Rebellion; the charge more likely to fall heavy on the unjust silencers, unless Mr: K. can prove both the divine right of the Convocation to be the Ecclesiastical Head of the Church of England, and the equity of their silencing sentence, from p: 51 to p. 59:

5 Q: Whether an Act of Parl: &c: Answered, p: 59, 60:

Some general Remarks on the rest of Mr: K's Answer, p. 60, 61, 62:

Reflections on the whole, from p: 62 to the end: A Postscript:

FINIS:

ERRATA.

PAge 7: l: 21: r: Arimini: (To line 21 add (And not the Catholick Church, as visible, or as measur'd by a Judgment of Charity, as the Papists assert, and Mr: K: with them, contrary to the stream of protestant writers on that Controversie) p: 9: l: 15: after commandment, add an &c: p: 23: l: 30: r: 7th v: p: 40: l: ult: r: prelacy. p: 59: l: 28: r: 5th Q: p: 63: l: 17: blot out a